

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



A study and edition of St. Victor's 'Commentary on Lamentations'.

McGuinness, Lucy Gabrielle

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**A STUDY AND EDITION OF HUGH OF ST VICTOR'S
COMMENTARY ON LAMENTATIONS**

by

Lucy Gabrielle McGuinness

A thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
at the University of London

Department of Classics
King's College London

1997



ABSTRACT

This thesis presents a study and partial edition of a medieval Latin commentary on Lamentations by the twelfth-century teacher and thinker, Hugh of St Victor (d.1141). Hitherto, there has been no critical edition of this work. The commentary is contained in (at least) fifty-five extant manuscripts dating from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries.

Preceding the edition, I present a full introductory study to the text. I place the work within its historical context, exploring various influences which fed into it, in particular, Hugh's preoccupations as a regular canon, teacher and theologian. I set it within the context of medieval Christian interpretations of Lamentations, examining its relationship with one traditional source, the Carolingian commentary by Paschasius Radbertus (d.860). I argue that, although Hugh derives certain elements from this earlier work, these two commentaries are fundamentally different.

I then focus on Hugh's own treatment of Lamentations, using internal evidence to prove that his exposition was originally not a cohesive work, but two distinct compositions. I give particular attention to his literal and allegorical interpretations of Lamentations 2. In the case of the literal sense, I highlight Hugh's preoccupation with the rhetorical force and structure of this poem. I show how, in his allegorical interpretation, he imposes the framework of religious history on Lamentations 2, from original sin to Judgement Day. I also discuss how Hugh develops certain themes, namely original sin, 'Jewish blindness', corrupt priests and heretics, arguing that exegesis can serve as a valuable source for the study of medieval thought and ideas.

This general introduction to the commentary is followed by a detailed study of its manuscript tradition. I establish the textual groupings of the majority of extant witnesses. I also use the manuscript evidence as a source for the history of the text, exploring its dissemination and reception from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries, in order to evaluate the significance of this work within medieval culture.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to the British Academy for a three-year postgraduate studentship, which included a grant for study abroad. I am also grateful to the Central Research Fund of the University of London, to the School of Humanities and Classics Department of King's College London, who very kindly provided generous funds for microfilms and research trips.

I thank the staff at the following libraries for their assistance:

Austria: Graz, Universitätsbibliothek; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek.

Belgium: Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert I^{er}; Bruges, Openbare Bibliotheek.

England: Cambridge, University Library, Sidney Sussex College; Eton, Eton College Library; London, British Library, King's College, Heythrop, Institute of Historical Research, Senate House, Warburg Institute, Wellcome Historical Medical Library; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Merton College.

France: *bibliothèques municipales* in Charleville, Douai, Rheims, Rouen, Soissons and Troyes; Montpellier, Ecole de médecine; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes.

Italy: Vatican Library.

Germany: Frankfurt, Hugo-von-Sankt-Viktor-Institut (Hochschule Sankt-Georgen).

I am also very grateful to the following for their kind help: Rainer Berndt, Charles Burnett, David d'Avray, Willis Johnson, David Knipp, Jill Kraye, Dominique Poirel, Patrice Sicard, Michael Silk and Patricia Stirneman. Tilly de la Mare's palaeography course at King's was invaluable. I would also like to acknowledge my indebtedness to the late Margaret Gibson, who introduced me to Hugh of St Victor. My supervisor, Carlotta Dionisotti, has been an inspiration to me since I was a first-year undergraduate at King's.

I have received support and encouragement from my family, in particular, my mother, father, brother Patrick and sister Whizz. Finally, I would like to thank Steve, for all his proofreading, morale-boosting and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations	page 7
INTRODUCTION	8
I. BACKGROUND TO <i>SUPER LAMENTATIONES</i>	10
1. Biography of Hugh of St Victor	10
2. St Victor and the Movement of Regular Canons	12
3. Hugh's <i>Oeuvre</i>	16
i. Hugh as teacher	16
ii. Hugh as theologian	20
iii. Hugh as contemplative	21
iv. Hugh as regular canon	22
v. Concluding remarks on Hugh's <i>oeuvre</i>	23
4. Lamentations in the Middle Ages	24
i. Liturgical Usage	24
ii. Patristic and Carolingian treatments of Lamentations	25
iii. Twelfth-century commentaries on Lamentations	30
iv. Paschasius Radbertus as Source	34
II. HUGH'S INTERPRETATION OF LAMENTATIONS	40
1. Threefold Interpretation	40
2. Tropological Interpretation	42
3. Literal Interpretation	45
i. Theory	45
ii. Application in <i>Super Lamentationes</i>	47
a. History	47
b. Letter	48
c. Structure and Rhetoric	49
d. Concluding remarks	59

4. Allegorical Interpretation	page 61
i. Theory	61
ii. Application in <i>Super Lamentationes</i>	63
iii. Original sin	66
iv. <i>Excecatio Iudeorum</i>	73
v. Church	84
vi. Concluding remarks	101
 III. MANUSCRIPT TRADITION	 104
1. Introduction	104
i. Evidence for Medieval Production of Hugh's Works	105
ii. Manuscript Groups	105
2. The Manuscripts	105
i. Σ Group	108
ii. Δ Group	137
iii. Ω Group	159
iv. Θ Group	173
v. Φ Group	190
vi. Ungrouped Manuscripts	242
vii. Comparison of Groups	249
a. Shared Errors between Groups	249
b. Difficult Readings	251

3. An Overview of the Manuscript Tradition	page 258
i. Dissemination	258
a. Number and Dating of Manuscripts	258
b. Geographical Diffusion	259
c. Institutional Diffusion	264
ii. Evidence for Uses of the Commentary	269
a. <i>Mise-en-page</i>	270
b. Additions	273
c. Title	275
d. Ascription	276
e. Accompanying Works	277
iii. Question of cohesion	281
4. Conclusion	282
Sigla	285
Notes on the Edition	287
TRACTATUS MAGISTRI HUGONIS SUPER LAMENTATIONES	288
Bibliography	393

List of Abbreviations

<i>BN</i>	<i>Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue général des manuscrits latins.</i> 5 vols (Paris, 1939-68)
<i>CCSL</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum Series Latina</i> (Turnhout, 1954-)
<i>CCCM</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Medievalis</i> (Turnhout, 1971-)
<i>CG</i>	<i>Catalogue général des manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques des Départements</i> (Paris, 1849-)
<i>ODCC</i>	F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, <i>Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church</i> (Oxford, 3 rd edition, 1997)
<i>PL</i>	J. P. Migne, <i>Patrologia Latina</i> , 221 vols and supplement (Paris, 1844-)

INTRODUCTION

Hugh of St Victor (d.1141) was a leading thinker and teacher of his day. He wrote on a wide variety of subjects, including education, theological doctrine and mystical contemplation. However, his numerous writings lack, in most instances, critical editions. Modern scholars have to rely, for the most part, on the nineteenth-century *Patrologia Latina* (volumes 175-177). This work is, however, only a reprint of a mid-seventeenth-century edition (Rouen, 1648). Until it is superseded by reliable texts, based on the manuscript evidence, serious study of Hugh's contribution will remain handicapped.

Among Hugh's many works yet to be edited figure his biblical commentaries. These are of particular interest because they were composed at a time when scriptural exegesis was undergoing significant developments. On the one hand, past authorities were excerpted and compiled into what was to become the standardized text-book for *lectio divina*, the *Glossa ordinaria*. On the other, there was increasing independence and innovation. As a teacher in an important school, Hugh's contribution to these developments is of considerable interest.

Although Hugh wrote in some detail about *lectio divina*, he composed few extended commentaries. One of these treated a minor book of the Bible, Lamentations. Hugh's exposition covers only Lamentations 1:1-3 and the whole of Lamentations 2. Nevertheless, his commentary represents a fully developed treatment, which fills sixty-five columns of the *PL* (vol. 175, cols 255 to 322B). It has, however, attracted little comment from modern scholars. The purpose of this thesis is to give this commentary the attention it deserves, and to make it more reliable and accessible than it is in its present form. My aims are threefold: to produce a partial critical edition, to trace the history of the text in the Middle Ages, and to explore its significance as a source for twelfth-century culture.

The published version of the text is characterized by a number of idiosyncracies, shared by no surviving medieval manuscripts. One example is the title ascribed by the *PL* to the commentary: *Adnotatiunculae elucidatoriae in Threnos Jeremiae*. A more representative and convenient title, and the one I have adopted, is *Super Lamentationes*. I have edited three-quarters of *Super*

Lamentationes, up to the end of Hugh's interpretation of Lamentations 2:16 (*PL* 175, col. 303C). I will preface this edition with a full discussion of the textual groupings of most of the surviving witnesses. Scrutiny of the manuscript evidence will also shed much light upon the dissemination and reception of this work from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries. I will trace the geographical and institutional diffusion of *Super Lamentationes*, searching for clues for its variety of uses; in short, I will investigate how widespread its influence was, who was reading it and why.

The thesis opens with an introductory study of *Super Lamentationes*, in which I will place the work within its historical context and relate it to the medieval Christian tradition of interpreting Lamentations. I will then turn to Hugh's own treatment of Lamentations, highlighting what is distinctive in his interpretations and identifying the main themes of the commentary. I will consider whether Hugh's handling of Lamentations 2 differs from that of Lamentations 1:1-3, in order to ascertain what is the relationship between these two parts and, in particular, whether they represent separate compositions. I will also explore the question of what motivated Hugh to devote so much attention to this minor book.

I. BACKGROUND TO *SUPER LAMENTATIONES*

1. Biography of Hugh of St Victor

Despite Hugh's importance as a twelfth-century teacher and theologian, little is known about his actual life. There is differing evidence concerning his place of origin. Robert of Torigny (d.1186) identifies this as Lorraine in his chronicle of 1154, *De immutatione ordinis monachorum*.¹ A note found in two related manuscripts names Ypres in Flanders as his birthplace: 'ex Ipprensi territorio ortus.'² However, it is now generally accepted that Hugh was Saxon, and that he was educated by the regular canons of Hammersleben in the diocese of Halberstadt.³ He addresses his *Soliloquium de arrha anime* to this community in a manner which strongly suggests close ties, referring to individuals by means of initials which may correspond to actual canons at this institution.⁴ According to the St Victor necrology, his uncle and namesake had been archdeacon of Halberstadt before joining St Victor in 1115. The letter which prefaces Hugh's *De uirtute orandi* includes a request to the recipients to pray for this deceased uncle, without naming him. Hugh's addressee is referred to as 'dominus et pater Th.', a possible reference to Thietmar (d.1138), the first abbot of Hammersleben.

There is little doubt that Hugh was at least educated in this community at Hammersleben. The important point to note is that his early formation was supervised by regular canons. The Augustinian house of St Pancras, where Hugh received his education, was founded around 1107-8 at Ostervieck and subsequently moved in 1109 to Hammersleben. It must have had a thriving school, as it was able to send educated clerics to Salzburg as early in its existence as 1110.⁵ One of his few autobiographical passages attests to a thorough

¹ PL 202, col. 1313A-B, quoted below p.12.

² Douai, Bibliothèque municipale. 363 (f.1^v) and 366, from the Benedictine abbeys of Anchin and Marchiennes respectively. The first also includes *Super Lamentationes*. This note is reproduced below p.204.

³ See P. Sicard, *Hugues de Saint-Victor et son école* (Turnhout, 1991), pp.13-15. I here summarize his arguments.

⁴ *Soliloquium de arrha anime*, Prologue, PL 176, cols 951-2.

⁵ Sicard, *Hugues*, p.15.

schooling which was advanced enough to include both the *trivium* and the *quadrivium*.⁶

Hugh claims to have been an exile from his native land from early on in his life: 'ego a puero exulaui.'⁷ At what point in his youth he left his home is not clear. The word *puer*, though generally translated as *boy*, might apply to an adolescent or even young adult. Indeed, it was not as a boy that Hugh joined Saint Victor, but as a young man, as testifies the entry for his death on 11 February 1141 in the St Victor necrology. This mentions that he became part of the community 'from the first flowering of his youth'.⁸ He probably attended the classes of Prior Thomas (d.1133), before himself becoming a teacher in the 1120s. The first reference to him as such is to be found in a letter, dating from 1127, by Lawrence, later abbot of Westminster, which prefaces the notes this pupil took during Hugh's lessons.⁹

⁶ Ibid. pp.15-16; *Didascalicon*, 6.3 (PL 176, col. 800A-B).

⁷ *Didascalicon*, 3.20 (778B). In this chapter, Hugh is advocating voluntary exile as a necessary step in the learning process which leads to wisdom.

⁸ 'Necrologium Sancti Victoris Parisiensis III Idus Februarie', PL 175, col. CLXIIID : 'a primario iuuentutis sue flore.'

⁹ *Sententie de diuinitate*, ed. by A.M. Piazzoni, 'Ugo di Santo Vittore 'auctor' delle *Sententie de diuinitate*', *Studi Medievali*, 23 (1962), 912-3; Sicard (*Hugues*, p.17) believes Hugh's pedagogical output suggests that he was appointed 'Master' before 1127.

2. St Victor and the Movement of Regular Canons

An awareness of Hugh's vocation as a regular canon underpins any understanding of *Super Lamentationes*. His membership (from an early age) of this young, reforming religious movement is highly relevant to his exposition of Lamentations. The specific form of 'the canonical and apostolic life' that St Victor adopted, with religious education at its core, deserves some discussion.

St Victor was still a new community when Hugh joined it. It was initially set up in 1108 by William of Champeaux (d.1121) at the foot of Mont Sainte-Geneviève on the outskirts of Paris. It was endowed with royal patronage and, in 1113, made an abbey with papal ratification. Its first abbot was elected in the following year.¹⁰ From the outset it housed an active school. William of Champeaux had himself been a leading teacher of dialectic at the thriving cathedral school of Notre Dame and was urged by Hildebert of Lavardin to continue this vocation in his new surroundings.¹¹ Under the abbacy of Gilduin (d.1155), elected to the post in 1114, both the abbey and school grew from strength to strength. Students were welcomed from far and wide, as Robert of Torigny's chronicle reports:

After William was elected bishop of Châlons, the venerable Gilduin, his pupil, became the first abbot. Under his government, many noble clerics, learned in profane as well as divine letters, came to this place to live, amongst whom Master Hugh, from Lorraine, in particular flourished, as much in the knowledge of letters as in a humble religious life.¹²

Owing to a letter of introduction from Bernard of Clairvaux (dating from 1134 to 1136), Peter Lombard studied under Hugh in the mid-1130s.¹³ The school was thus famous in its day. Despite being situated outside the city walls on the left

¹⁰ For a history of St Victor, see F. Bonnard, *Histoire de l'abbaye royale et de l'ordre des chanoines réguliers de St-Victor*, 2 vols (Paris, 1904); R-H. Bautier, 'Origines et premiers développements de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor', in J. Longère (ed.), *L'abbaye parisienne de St-Victor au Moyen Age: Communications présentées aux douzième colloque d'Humanisme médiévale de Paris (1986-88)* (Paris, 1991), pp.23-52; Sicard, *Hugues*, pp.7-13.

¹¹ *Epistulae*, 1.1 (PL 171, cols 141A-3A).

¹² For reference, see footnote 1.

¹³ *Epistula* 410, *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, ed. J. Leclercq and H. Rochais (Rome, 1977), p.391.

bank of the Seine, it was within close proximity to other major schools, most notably Notre-Dame and Sainte-Geneviève.¹⁴ Notre-Dame is thought to have been a precursor to the university which was to evolve later on. St Victor doubtless contributed to making Paris the hub of medieval intellectual life in the West. Certainly, it gave rise to a considerable body of twelfth-century writings, ranging from the intellectual to the devotional, from religious thought to liturgical sequences.

Liturgical composition became an important activity at St Victor. For it was not simply a place of intense study. Community worship was of prime importance. The Victorines lived by a strict rule, and thus resembled a monastic order rather than the secular clergy of the towns. Indeed, in the 1120s or 1130s, Abbot Gilduin organized the composition of a 'customary' - the *Liber ordinis Sancti Victoris Parisiensis* - which was to mark St Victor's independence as a canonical congregation.¹⁵ As regular canons, the Victorines followed the *Rule of St Augustine* to regulate daily life, from which a passage was read to the community every day.¹⁶ This Rule had been rediscovered in the eleventh century and at that time consisted of an adaptation of Letter 211 of St Augustine, concerning chastity, charity and harmony, followed by a monastic set of regulations on liturgical prayer, reading, silence and poverty, probably dating from the fifth century. Both these elements were amended in the early twelfth century and became known as the *Regula tertia* and the *Regula secunda* respectively.¹⁷

The *Rule of St Augustine* was well-suited to the belief propagated during the eleventh century that the lives of clerics should be strictly regulated. Communities of regular canons rose up and spread, particularly in southern France and in Italy. These were largely a response to the Gregorian reforms which

¹⁴ *Liber ordinis Sancti Victoris Parisiensis*, ed. by L. Jocqué and L. Milis, CCCM 61 (Turnhout, 1984), p. viii: '(Guillaume de Champeaux) s'installe à quelques centaines de mètres seulement de Notre-Dame et à une distance moindre encore de l'abbaye de Sainte-Geneviève, centre elle-même d'une agglomération suburbaine.'

¹⁵ Ibid., p.ix: 'Saint-Victor occupe une place plus indépendante: issu d'un milieu plus ancien, plus traditionnel, on y connut moins l'influence cistercienne ou canoniale. L'exemple de Cluny l'a marquée d'une forte empreinte.'

¹⁶ It is worth noting that a commentary on this *Rule* (*Expositio super Regulam Beati Augustini*, PL 176, cols 882A-924D) has been attributed to Hugh, although it is generally accepted that this is a false attribution.

¹⁷ See C. H. Lawrence, *Medieval Monasticism*, 2nd edition (London and New York, 1989), pp.163-9.

aimed at eliminating malpractice among priests, such as concubinage and simony. In addition, they were intended to awaken a sense of their *apostolic* calling, which involved leading a life of shared worship and emulating the Apostles in throwing off any ties to personal possessions. The Gregorian ideal was that clergy in towns should become less *secular* and more *monastic* in conduct, while carrying out their usual pastoral functions.

Not all the houses of regular canons followed the austere *Rule of St Augustine*. In fact, there was a wide variety of practices among them, and customaries bear witness to their individual concerns. What these clerics shared, however, was a spirit of reform. Poverty, simple living, obedience and moderation were fostered. Some houses had full liturgical rounds, others practised the shorter office associated with secular priests. Generally, study was encouraged. Certain houses were more cloistered than others, turning away from involvement in the world outside. Others were committed to the apostolic ideal of pastoral duties, ranging from education to the care of the sick. Religious study fostered not just liturgical prayer and private worship, but also the ability to preach and minister to the laity. André Vauchez has claimed that this movement did not aim to model priests on monks, but to exalt the priesthood by making its representatives purer intermediaries between God and men.¹⁸

St Victor itself was founded by an advocate of reform. William of Champeaux's leanings in this direction had lost him favour with ecclesiastics and aristocracy alike, forcing him eventually to abandon his post of archdeacon of Paris and teacher at Notre Dame to retreat to the 'solitude' of a more cloistered life. Reforming activity continued under the auspices of Abbot Gilduin, who strove to introduce canonical regulations into several churches. By Gilduin's death, the community of St Victor presided over 'a powerful federation of abbeys, covering the whole north of the realm and extending beyond its frontiers'.¹⁹ Indeed, the above-mentioned *Liber ordinis*, composed at Gilduin's instigation, bears witness to a highly ordered life. Liturgical rounds and ritualized, at times ascetic, practices were part of everyday existence.

¹⁸ A. Vauchez, *La spiritualité au Moyen Age occidental* (Paris, 1994), p.89.

¹⁹ Bauthier, 'Origines', p.35.

Hugh belonged, therefore, to a community which was itself part of a reforming movement with evangelical and apostolic ideals. Daily life was structured around regulated religious practices. Instruction lay at the heart of its activities and marked its most influential point of contact with the world outside, for which Hugh himself was largely responsible.

3. Hugh's *Oeuvre*

Hugh's *Super Lamentationes* needs to be set within the context of his body of work as a whole. His contribution cannot be confined to one area, given the sheer breadth of his interests. Bonaventure (d.1274) - admittedly a devoted follower - sums it up: 'Anselmus in ratiocinatione, Bernardus in praedicatione, Richardus in contemplatione - Hugo vero omnia haec.' ('Anselm in reasoning, Bernard in preaching, Richard in contemplation - Hugh in all these areas.')

²⁰

i. Hugh as teacher

Hugh's activity as a teacher contributed to his own time and beyond. It is not surprising, then, that the majority of manuscripts which contain his commentary on Lamentations refer to him as *Magister*. Indeed, it was largely his role as school-master between about 1125 and his death in 1141 that made the school of St Victor the renowned and frequented centre of learning that it became during his lifetime. Certain works testify to his direct involvement in the teaching of the *trivium* and the *quadrivium*.²¹ Others clearly served as study aids to facilitate students' grasp of historical and geographical facts.²² Such examples of teaching material bear witness to a clear interest in pedagogy. But Hugh did not simply cater for specific areas of school activities. He also composed a handbook which had as its scope the whole programme of education: the *Didascalicon*.

This influential treatise, dating from the end of the 1120s, became a widely diffused pedagogical manual.²³ It represented a reorganization and reaffirmation

²⁰ Bonaventure, *Opusculum de reductione artium ad theologiam*, 5. Bonaventure's 'attachment' to Hugh is an interesting subject, but not one for discussion in this present work. J. de Ghellinck, *Le Mouvement théologique du douzième siècle* (Bruges-Brussels-Paris, 1948), p.196, mentioned that Dante places Hugh next to Bonaventure in Paradise (*Paradiso*, 12.133).

²¹ *De grammatica*, in R. Baron (ed.), *Hugonis de Sancto Victore opera propædeutica* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1966), pp.75-163; *Practica geometrie*, Ibid., pp.15-64.

²² For example, *Chronicon/De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum*, of which there are partial editions in the following: G. Waitz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores*, 24, pp.88-97; W. M. Green, 'De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum', *Speculum* 18 (1943), 488-492; R. Baron, 'Mappa mundi', *Cultura Neolatina*, 16 (1956), 139-145; *Descriptio mappe mundi*, ed. by P. Gautier Dalché, *La 'Descriptio mappe mundi' de Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Paris, 1988).

²³ According to R. Goy, *Die Überlieferung der Werke Hugos von Sankt-Viktor: Ein Beitrag zur Kommunikationsgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, 1976), pp.14-36, 125 extant manuscripts

of what should constitute a curriculum for study, updated for the twelfth century and in many ways responding to contemporary developments. In the lineage of didascallic literature, most notably, Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*, Cassiodorus's *Institutiones*, Isidore's *Etymologiae* and Hrabanus Maurus's *De institutione clericorum*, it marked some significant departures.²⁴ What is striking is the value Hugh bestows upon studies, which he sees as the necessary path back to *Sapientia*, that is Christ. Distinctive too is the broad compass of Hugh's definition of science, embracing, for instance, within his fourfold classification of what constitutes philosophy (the mother-subject of all), the mechanical arts (namely, 'fabric-making, armament, commerce, agriculture, hunting, medicine, and theatrics').²⁵ Hugh's approach to education was comprehensive with regard to not just what should be studied, but also to who should be a student. He argues that it is the duty of every man to undertake studies, regardless of their financial means.²⁶ The impulse here to extend education to the outside world perhaps stems from Hugh's vocation as a regular canon.²⁷

This educational programme, which probably shaped studies at the school of St Victor,²⁸ distinguished this centre from the monastic context, to which in other respects it was related. It marked St Victor as an urban school, but not one entirely in the mould of other such centres. Hugh's activities were distinct precisely because of their broad scope at a time of increasing specialization, 'when

contain it. Goy's figures can easily be augmented. An example of its later influence is the way in which Hugh's classification of subjects was adopted by John of Salisbury, Albert the Great and Bonaventure.

²⁴ See J. Taylor (tr.), *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St Victor* (New York, 1961), pp.28-36. All the translations from the *Didascalicon* will be from this edition.

²⁵ 2.20. (PL 176, 760A); W. Wetherbee, 'Philosophy, cosmology and the Renaissance' in P. Dronke (ed.), *A History of Twelfth-Century Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988), p.23, argues that the Victorines 'value...not the practicalities of the mechanical arts, but the *ratio* in the light of which they become sources of a knowledge that leads ultimately to God'. In fact, the mechanical arts do have a practical application. For Hugh sees them as belonging to those sciences which provide for the necessities of life.

²⁶ *Didascalicon*, preface, Buttimer (ed.), p.1. See I. Illich, *In the Vineyard of the Text: A Commentary on Hugh's 'Didascalicon'* (Chicago and London, 1993), pp.75-83.

²⁷ See Taylor's introduction to the *Didascalicon*, p.38.

²⁸ Sicard, *Hugues*, p.18: '...si le *Didascalicon* est bien, comme on l'a justement caractérisé, la *ratio studiorum* des étudiants de Saint-Victor, il est aussi le programme de travail du maître, il inspire les idées directrices de ses ouvrages subséquent ainsi que la matière (*quid*), l'ordonnance intrinsèque (*quo ordine*) et les méthodes (*quomodo*) de ses cours.'

education in the new centres was becoming specialized, hence unbalanced, according to the limited enthusiasms or capacities of particular masters'.²⁹

Hugh sets out what he believes are the aims of education with striking clarity. The fundamental purpose of learning is to seek Wisdom in order to be illuminated, so that '[man] may recognize himself'.³⁰ Philosophy, which is at the pinnacle of all studies, has as its goal a restoration of our true nature before the Fall and a communion with Christ who is Wisdom itself. This is a grand objective for education, elevating studies to a very high status indeed. Nevertheless, Hugh also acknowledges the usefulness of learning in serving the needs which are unavoidable in this present life.³¹ Education, therefore, has both spiritual and practical goals.

In the *Didascalicon*, the liberal arts laid the foundations for studying the Bible. They served as aids to *lectio divina*, the culmination, in Hugh's eyes, of the liberal arts. These belonged to an inferior realm of knowledge, but were a necessary basis for the superior wisdom one could attain through reading and understanding the Bible.

Hugh's contribution to biblical exegesis in the twelfth century is obviously highly relevant to any consideration of *Super Lamentationes*. He has attracted attention for writing on exegetical method, both in the last three books of the *Didascalicon* and in the later work *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris*, which has been described as the only 'treatise on (biblical) hermeneutics' of its time.³² Hugh's role as exegete has been amply debated. Divergences in modern opinion have emerged concerning Hugh's contribution to medieval intellectual history.

²⁹ Taylor, *Didascalicon*, intro., p.4. He continues that 'when, in response to the flowering of secular life, learning itself was making secularist adaptations. In contrast, for example, to the specializations in law, medicine, or the poetic arts at the schools of Bologna, Salerno, Montpellier, Tours, and Orléans; in contrast to the belletristic humanism of a John of Salisbury, a Bernardus Silvestris, or a Matthew of Vendôme; in contrast to the concern with a Platonized quadrivium and physics of the Chartrian masters, or the absorption in dialectic of an Abelard, or the demand for a quick, moneymaking education by the Cornificians; in contrast, finally, to Cistercianism, which forbade "profane" learning and aimed to make of every monastery a "school of charity" only, the *Didascalicon* set forth a programme insisting on the indispensability of a whole complex of the traditional arts and on the need for their scientific pursuit in a particular order by all men as a means both of relieving the physical weaknesses of earthly life and of restoring that union with the divine Wisdom for which man was made'.

³⁰ *Didascalicon* 1.1 (PL 176, col. 741C-D).

³¹ Ibid., 1.5 (745B)

³² C. Spicq, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen-âge* (Paris, 1944), p.120.

One (well-known) argument is that Hugh's originality lay in criticizing rife allegorizing and promoting the literal sense of the Bible, thus paving the way for major advances in biblical scholarship.³³ This has been directly disputed by one particular scholar, who has argued cogently that Hugh's exegetical practice was simply a consolidation and promotion of the traditional doctrine of the senses.³⁴ Hugh may well have been simply reiterating and reorganizing past thought concerning biblical exegesis. What is interesting is that he did it at all. Perhaps he felt the need to reaffirm the scriptural basis of theological thought in the face of the more speculative reasoning of certain contemporaries, such as Abelard.

For one who reflected on the task of reading the Bible and gave it such prominence in the educational programme, Hugh himself composed few extended commentaries. His *Notule* on the Pentateuch and Octateuch constitute a literal interpretation of these sections of the Bible. They are in a somewhat chaotic shape, as they have been preserved for us most probably as lecture notes taken during Hugh's classes. They offer us evidence, therefore, for how *lectio divina* took place in the classroom. We also have sundry expositions of odd verses among the multifarious short pieces of exegesis, tracts, homilies, letters and so forth, now assembled in the *Miscellanea*.³⁵ Several of the Psalms are given mystical and moral interpretations.³⁶ There are expositions on verses from other biblical texts, such as the Song of Songs, Isaiah, the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles.³⁷ Some of his exegetical output possibly served to expound the liturgy.³⁸ But developed works of biblical commentary, which can definitely be attributed to

³³ Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 3rd ed., 1984), pp.85-97. Her view has been tremendously influential on views of Hugh: e.g., H. J. Pollitt, 'Hugh of St Victor as Biblical Exegete' (unpublished Ph.D, Sheffield University, 1960). The entry on Hugh in the *ODCC*, p.801, illustrates this view: 'In his biblical commentaries, he gave new emphasis to the historical study of Scripture and to the importance of studying the literal sense.' See also J. van Zwieten, *The Place and Significance of Literal Exegesis in Hugh of St Victor: an Analysis of his Notes on the Pentateuch, the Book of Judges, and the Four Books of Kings* (Amsterdam, 1992).

³⁴ H. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: les quatre sens de l'Ecriture* (Paris, 1961), pp.287-359.

³⁵ *Miscellanea*, PL 177, 469C-900C.

³⁶ *Miscellanea*, 2 (PL 177, cols 588-634A).

³⁷ This disordered collection in part serves as likely evidence for *lectio divina* at the school.

³⁸ For example, *In canticum Beate Marie* (PL 175, cols 413B-432B); *De oratione dominica* (PL 175, cols 774B-789A); *Institutiones in Decalogum* (PL 176, cols 9A-18B).

Hugh, number only two: *In Ecclesiasten*³⁹ and *Super Lamentationes*. Thus, Hugh's longest exegetical works did not concern the books of the Bible which attracted most commentators, such as Genesis, the Psalms, the Song of Songs, the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles. Both Ecclesiastes and Lamentations were books of lesser importance to Christian teaching and the liturgical calendar. Reasons for his selection of these particular texts will be explored in due course.

ii. Hugh as theologian

The lack of fully-developed biblical commentaries may be the consequence of the unfinished nature of Hugh's composition in general, much of which clearly arose out of Hugh's teaching activities. But there may be another reason for this surprising gap. For although Hugh did indeed stress the centrality of the Bible to theological enquiry, he was also himself moving away from this textual base into the nascent realm of theological thought. Hugh's *magnum opus*, *De sacramentis Christiane fidei*, has come down to us in draft form, but is complete enough to afford us insight into both Hugh's thinking and methods of work.⁴⁰ Composed during the last decade of his life, it is in some ways the culmination of his thought. *De sacramentis* represented an early example of a theological *summa* (Hugh's own word).⁴¹ It enjoyed an impressive and widespread diffusion, and influenced subsequent theologians, such as Peter Lombard, Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas.⁴² We find Hugh reorganizing and reworking both his own writings and patristic sources. He incorporated earlier of his own works, as he himself signalled in the preface.⁴³ That interchange with students gave rise to this *summa* is borne out by the existence of lecture notes taken by Lawrence of Westminster, now

³⁹ PL 175, cols 113C-258C. According to Goy (*Überlieferung*, pp.329-340), this commentary is contained in 60 manuscripts; however, the director of the Hugo-von-Sankt-Viktor-Institut, Rainer Berndt, estimates the figure as greater than 100.

⁴⁰ PL 176, cols 183A-610A; *De sacramentis* has been translated into English by R. J. Deferrari (Cambridge: Massachusetts, 1951). All the translations from *De sacramentis* will be taken from this edition.

⁴¹ *De sacramentis*, 1, prologue (cols 183-4).

⁴² Goy, *Überlieferung*, pp.133-172: complete text in 112 manuscripts; only Book 1 in 56 and only Book 2 in 56.

⁴³ PL 176, cols 173-4.

known as the *Sententie de divinitate*.⁴⁴ Moreover, the impression is often gained that Hugh is responding to difficult theological questions, particularly in Book 1. The unfinished state of the work reveals Hugh's methods of composition. He took patristic sources, the most influential being in this instance Augustine, and restated their thought using his own expression.⁴⁵

We find in *De sacramentis* the same attention to organization that is apparent in the *Didascalicon*, and a similar clarity of thought. The whole work is structured according to an Augustinian historical scheme, falling into two parts, one devoted to the 'work of creation' (*opus conditionis*), the other to 'the work of restoration' (*opus restaurationis*). The Incarnation is at the centre, but straddles both 'works', with Christ as king in the middle of an army, whose soldiers in front are those of the Old Testament heralding His coming, and whose retinue belong to the age following the New Testament right up to the end of time.⁴⁶ Although the central theory of *De sacramentis* is not applied in *Super Lamentationes*, we will see in the latter a similar overriding structure.

iii. Hugh as contemplative

Hugh's doctrines were not only shaped by an Augustinian historical view of the *dispensatio*, but also inherited, partly from that Father, a Neoplatonic strand. He was important as a thinker who continued the Neoplatonic tradition in the twelfth century. An overt example of this is his commentary on the *Celestial Hierarchy* of pseudo-Dionysius, which enjoyed a large circulation.⁴⁷ But we find a Neoplatonic colouring suffusing the thought and expression within a number of his works, particularly ones we might term 'mystical'. Thus, the notion of ascent to God frequently recurs, including the idea of the stages one must pass through to reach

⁴⁴ See above footnote 9.

⁴⁵ See H. Weisweiler, 'Die Arbeitsmethode Hugos von Sankt-Viktor. Ein Beitrag zum Entstehen seines Hauptwerkes *De sacramentis*', in *Scholastik* 20-24 (1949) 59-87, 232-67; De Ghellinck, *Mouvement*, p.194, draws attention to Hugh's practice of assimilating past thinkers' ideas without using their expressions. On Hugh's attention to expressing thought, Illich, *Vineyard*, p.7, remarks: 'Hugh rewrites the same passage innumerable times and laboriously constructs his phrases so that his complex of thought finds adequate expression in all its shadings.'

⁴⁶ *De sacramentis*, 1.1.2 (PL 176, col. 183B).

⁴⁷ PL 177, cols 923B-1154C, according to Goy, *Überlieferung*, pp.181-195, this commentary is contained in 81 extant manuscripts.

‘contemplation’ of Him.⁴⁸ God may be discerned in His creation, but to approach Him, one must rise beyond this physical realm. This is achieved by reflection upon the vanity of the world around,⁴⁹ and by introspection, both in pondering one’s fallen state,⁵⁰ and in transcending the visible realm. One of Hugh’s most renowned compositions, *De archa Noe*,⁵¹ instructs the individual on how to achieve inner peace and stability in a world of vicissitudes by internalizing the potent symbol of the ark, with both its whole and its elements symbolizing aspects of religious experience, leading ultimately to contemplation of God.

The contemplative aspect of Hugh’s preoccupations were a lasting legacy for St Victor itself, paving the way for a mystical tradition which was to characterize many of the works written by later twelfth-century Victorines, such as Richard (d.1173) and Walter (d. after 1180). It also indicated a focus on a more personalized religious experience, in an age when spirituality was undergoing profound changes.⁵² This possibly explains Hugh’s preoccupation with the religious nature of love in his treatises, for example, *De arrha anime* (by far his most popular work in the Middle Ages, contained in over three hundred and twenty extant manuscripts and translated into sundry languages).⁵³

iv. Hugh as regular canon

The quest for reunion with *Wisdom* was for Hugh an active process. The stages which necessarily preceded contemplation involved practical application. Hugh was vocal as a regular canon, putting stress on the practice of the true Christian life. This focus is apparent in his works on liturgy,⁵⁴ prayer,⁵⁵ correct and ordered

⁴⁸ For example, *In Ecclesiasten* presents the hierarchy of the three processes *cogitatio*, *meditatio*, *contemplatio*, e.g., 116D-118D.

⁴⁹ For example, *In Ecclesiasten*; *De tribus diebus*, PL 176, cols 811C-838B (according to Goy, *Überlieferung*, pp.98-115, this work is contained in one hundred and fourteen extant manuscripts, so clearly an important work); *De vanitate mundi*, PL 176, cols 703A-740C.

⁵⁰ *Didascalicon*, 1.1 (PL 176, cols 741D-742D).

⁵¹ PL 176, cols 618C-680D; forthcoming edition by P. Sicard CCCM (Turnhout); according to Goy, *Überlieferung*, pp.212-237, this work is contained in 152 extant manuscripts, so is a very widely diffused work.

⁵² See Vauchez, *Spiritualité* pp.68-130.

⁵³ *De arrha anime*, PL 176, cols 951B-970D.

⁵⁴ See above footnote 38.

⁵⁵ For example, *De uirtute orandi*, PL 176, cols 977A-988A (according to Goy, *Überlieferung*, pp.404-438, contained in 226 extant manuscripts, so a very widely diffused work).

conduct,⁵⁶ and the fight against vices,⁵⁷ topics one would very much link with the milieu of the cloister. Nonetheless, he had a clear interest in the priesthood. This is notably the case in Book 2 of *De sacramentis*, where he sets out ecclesiastical conventions on matters such as clerical office and the apparel of ministry, as well discussing in depth the actual sacraments which fell in the domain of the priest.

v. Concluding remarks on Hugh's *oeuvre*

Hugh's writings reveal him to have been, at one and the same time, an educator, theologian, contemplative and regular canon. The broad scope he advocated for studies is a distinctive stance in an age of the strict monasticism of the Cistercians and others. His reorganization of past authorities possibly resulted from a certain 'traditionalism' in the face of contemporary intellectual developments. Hugh was steeped in past sources, winning Bonaventure's admiration for his knowledge of the Fathers. The latter distinguished three past thinkers who influenced Hugh in three major areas; as Ivan Illich sums it up, 'Augustine [was] his teacher in speculative theology, Gregory the Great in its practical application and Pseudo-Dionysius in mystical contemplation'.⁵⁸ But Hugh did not simply transmit these. He reworked them, developing ideas he had inherited with a certain clarity of thought and approach. This tendency is very much at play in his *Super Lamentationes*. But in order to see how Hugh adapted tradition to suit his own ends, it is essential to identify what that tradition was.

⁵⁶ *De institutione nouitiorum*, PL 176, cols 925A-952B.

⁵⁷ *De quinque septenis*, PL 175, cols 405A-410C.

⁵⁸ Illich, *Vineyard*, p.9, n.5. The reference to Bonaventure is *De reductione artium ad theologiam*, *Opera omnia* V, 321B (Claras Aquas, 1882-1902).

4. Lamentations in the Middle Ages

i. Liturgical Usage

In the *Didascalicon*, when discussing the names of the books of the Bible, Hugh refers to Lamentations by quoting from Isidore's *Etymologies* (in which Isidore himself draws on Jerome):

Jeremiah too produced his book, together with its Threnodies, which we call Lamentations, because they are used on sadder occasions and at rites for the dead. He has constructed them along with the Hebrew alphabet, four times repeated, using different metres. The first two alphabets are written in something resembling Sapphic verse, because three short lines of verse, closely conjoined and each beginning with the same letter are concluded with a heroic line. The third alphabet is written in trimeter, and in it sets of three stanzas begin with the same Hebrew letter. The fourth alphabet is like the first and second.⁵⁹

It would be interesting to know more about the use of Lamentations on these 'sad occasions' and in funeral rites. What can be said with certainty is that Lamentations played a limited but significant role in Church liturgy. During Easter week, for the first Nocturn of Matins on Maundy Thursday, Good Friday and Holy Saturday, certain verses of it were sung along with responsories.⁶⁰ There survive medieval manuscripts containing musically notated texts of Lamentations.⁶¹

The *Liber ordinis* of St Victor proves that Lamentations had a further use, at least in the Victorine community. The section on what should be read at meal-

⁵⁹ *Didascalicon*, 4.8 (PL 176, cols 782C); Hugh is drawing on Isidore, *Etymologies*, 6.2.22-24.

⁶⁰ See *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. S. Sadie (London, 1980), pp.410-11: up to the sixteenth century, there was great variety in the number and selection of verses. See E. A. Matter, 'The Lamentations Commentaries of Hrabanus Maurus and Paschasius Radbertus', *Traditio*, 38 (1983), 138-9, n.7, where Matter cites an example of the selection of verses, taken from a tenth-century liturgical codex from Saint-Martial, Limoges (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 740), ff.175^v-179^r: on Maundy Thursday, Lamentations 1:1-14; on Good Friday: 2:8-15 and 3:1-9; on Holy Saturday, 3:22-30, 4:1-6, and 5:1-11.

⁶¹ Sadie (ed.), *Grove*, p.411.

times throughout the religious calendar indicates that an 'exposition' of this work was reading material during Passiontide:

From 'These are the days' up until Easter, Jeremiah should be read, the exposition of Augustine on the Lord's Passion, the exposition of Lamentations and sermons on the Lord's Passion.⁶²

The existence of his own commentary might have prompted the inclusion of an exposition of Lamentations in the refectory reading-matter. An 'exposition' of Ecclesiastes was established material for the period from July to August and Hugh expounded most of this work. But this is probably a late composition, and the *Liber ordinis* is dated to the 1120s and 1130s. Moreover, for the period from November to December, an exposition on Ezechiel among other works was recommended, but Hugh wrote no such text.

ii. Patristic and Carolingian treatments of Lamentations

Until the twelfth century, commentaries on Lamentations were uncommon. There was no Latin patristic commentary. The Greek exposition by Origen, of which fragments survive in Byzantine *catenae*,⁶³ has no extant translations into Latin, casting doubt on whether it was in fact transmitted to the medieval West.⁶⁴ This is not the case for Origen's translated sermons on Jeremiah. These were used by Latin writers, most notably Jerome, whose own commentary on this biblical text shows the clear influence of this Greek exegete. Hrabanus Maurus (780-856) claimed to have used fourteen of Origen's sermons when expounding Jeremiah.⁶⁵ The final books of Hrabanus's commentary on this Prophet treat Lamentations. But Hrabanus makes no direct reference to Origen's interpretation of these

⁶² *Liber ordinis*, 48: 'Ab "Isti sunt dies" usque ad Pascha legatur Ieremias et expositio Augustini de passione Domini et expositio Lamentationum et sermones de passione Domini.'

⁶³ *Patrologia Graeca*, 13, cols 606C-62B.

⁶⁴ Matter, 'Lamentations', p.140, mentions that Eusebius makes no reference to Lamentations in his list of books of the Bible interpreted by Origen.

⁶⁵ Hrabanus' commentary on Jeremiah is contained in *PL* 111, cols 793-1272.

poems. The evidence indicates, therefore, that the earliest exposition of Lamentations did not influence Latin exegetes.

The Carolingians had, consequently, to fill in the gap left by a lack of any patristic commentary in Latin on this text. Clearly, Lamentations was not of particular significance to the Church Fathers. However, they did not pass it over in total silence. Jerome does mention these poems in his letter to Paula,⁶⁶ where he comments upon their structure, as reproduced by Hugh above (via the intermediary of Isidore). Jerome sets out, at Paula's request, the meanings given to letters of the Hebrew alphabet used in certain Psalms,⁶⁷ which, he notes, precede each verse of Lamentations 1-4. His interpretation of the Hebrew letters was to influence commentaries on Lamentations.

Gregory the Great, in his seminal *Moralia in Job*, wove into his exposition of Job a scattering of interpretations of particular verses of Lamentations, which in total number twenty-five (picked from Lamentations 1-4). For example, when interpreting Job 30:3, he speaks of Jeremiah lamenting the sinful soul:

Qui rodebant in solitudine, squalentes calamitate et miseria.
Sed hoc in loco cum solitudo per obiurgationem dicitur, quid aliud quam boni destitutio demonstratur? Vnde et sub Iudaeae typo Ieremias peccatoris animam deplorat dicens: 'Quomodo sedet sola civitas plena populo.'⁶⁸

They roamed in the wilderness, squalid in disaster and misery.
At this point, when wasteland is said ^{by way of} rebuke, what else except the abandonment of the good is designated? Jeremiah too deplores the soul of the sinner under the type of ~~Judea~~ saying: *How lonely sat the city full of people.*

The actual destruction depicted in Lamentations thus typifies the assault of sinfulness on the soul. But Gregory's use of these poems is not confined to its tropological interpretation. The scourge inflicted upon Jerusalem also represents the troubles which burden the Church.⁶⁹ Furthermore, at another point, where he

⁶⁶ *Epistula* 30, ed. by I. Hilberg, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 54 (Vienna-Leipzig, 1910), pp.243-49

⁶⁷ Psalms 110, 111, 118 and 144.

⁶⁸ *Moralia in Job*, 20.14.26.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 13.12.15.

expounds Job 12:21, he draws in a line from Lamentations 2:5 to support the view that the Jews were rejected for their denial of Christ:

Sed cum incarnationis dominicae mysterium Iudaea negavit, gentilitas credidit et principes in despectionem ceciderunt, et hi qui oppressi in culpa perfidiae fuerant in uerae fidei libertate leuati sunt. Hunc uero Israelitarum casum longe ante Ieremias intuens ait: 'Factus est Dominus velut inimicus; praecipitavit Israel.'⁷⁰

But when Judea denied the mystery of the Lord's Incarnation, the gentiles believed and the leaders became the objects of contempt. Those who in the guilt of perfidy had been oppressed were lifted in the freedom of the true faith. But Jeremiah, when seeing long before this fall of the Israelites, said: 'The Lord has become like an enemy. He has cast down Israel.'

Thus, for Gregory, Lamentations had both moral and mystical significance. His interpretations of it were to influence the first fully-fledged commentators of these laments.

Gregory was not, however, the first to associate Jerusalem and its fall - the central topic of Lamentations - with Christian themes. There may have been no Latin patristic commentary on Lamentations, but interpretations of Jerusalem had a long history. Hrabanus Maurus quoted from John Cassian when discussing the fourfold senses of the Scriptures, using a formulation which was commonplace in Hugh's time:⁷¹

...the same Jerusalem can be understood in four different ways: historically as the city of the Jews, allegorically as the Church of Christ, anagogically as God's heavenly city, a mother for all of us, and tropologically as the soul of each individual, which is often reproached or praised in the Scriptures under this appellation.⁷²

⁷⁰ Ibid. 11.16.

⁷¹ An example of a twelfth-century repetition of this idea can be found in Guibert of Nogent, *Quo ordine sermo fieri debeat* (= prologue to *Moralia in Genesim*), *PL* 157, col. 26A.

⁷² *Enarrationes in epistolas Pauli* 15.4 (*PL* 112, col. 331C); on Galatians 4:22-6; tr. by David Jones in A. Piltz, *The World of Medieval Learning* (Oxford, 1981), p.30. Hrabanus is here quoting from John Cassian, *Collationes*, 14.8.

Hrabanus Maurus wrote the first full-scale Latin commentary on Lamentations, devoting three books to it at the end of his commentary on Jeremiah (Books 18-20, of which Book 19 deals solely with Lamentations 3), as if Lamentations were part of this book of the Bible. The motivation for this inclusion may simply have been his objective of providing expositions of most, if not all the Scriptures.

The four basic senses of Jerusalem which Hrabanus mentioned in his discussion of Galatians 4:26 might have led one to expect that his actual interpretation would fall into a fourfold scheme. Instead, each verse is interpreted historically and mystically, the latter sense being sometimes allegorical, but mainly tropological. The historical interpretation puts the emphasis from the outset on the idea that the Jewish people deserved the punishment dealt to them, both when their city was laid waste and they were forced into exile in Babylon, and subsequently when the Romans, as he presents it, reduced Jerusalem to nothing once and for all and scattered the Jewish people for all time. Their idolatry and the immensity of their sins, of which Christ's crucifixion is counted the worst, are clearly stated as the reasons for this affliction.⁷³ Hrabanus presents this as a simple story of crime and punishment, with little room for a consideration of the nature of their suffering. Their grief has come too late; there can be no hope of redemption.⁷⁴ It is a harsh world that he presents, as can also be seen in his mystical readings, with, for instance, the menacing prediction of future perdition and perpetual groaning for the sinful soul,⁷⁵ a world where the Day of Judgement may strike at any time.⁷⁶

Here is not the place to discuss in detail the character of Hrabanus's exposition of Lamentations. Interesting though this might be, it is unnecessary, given that this work was superseded by the commentary of a near contemporary of his, Paschasius Radbertus (785^c-860).⁷⁷ Paschasius became the more significant source for later medieval exegesis, as illustrated by the adoption of his commentary by Gilbert the Universal (d. c.1134) in the twelfth-century *Glossa*

⁷³ For example, on 1.1 (PL 111, 1185A-B), 1.2 (1185D), 2.11 (1206B-C), 2.13 (1208B), 2.17 (1209D-1210A).

⁷⁴ On 1.2 (Ibid., 1185D).

⁷⁵ For example, 1.2 (Ibid., 1185C), 2.17 (1210C-1211B).

⁷⁶ On 2.13, 2.21 (Ibid., 1215B).

⁷⁷ *Expositio in Lamentationes Hieremiae libri V*, ed. by B. Paulus, CCCM 85 (Turnhout, 1988).

ordinaria. Although Hrabanus served as a major source for other parts of the *Glossa ordinaria*, one can see why Paschasius was chosen as the authority on Lamentations.⁷⁸ There was one particularly good reason for this: he expounded this collection of five poems as a book in its own right, distinct from Jeremiah. (Hrabanus acknowledged that some took Lamentations as a separate book.)⁷⁹

Paschasius understandably relied heavily upon Hrabanus in his exposition of this book, at times citing him verbatim. He shares, for example, Hrabanus's focus on the wickedness and sinfulness of the Jewish people.⁸⁰ But there is much that is distinct about Paschasius's commentary. To begin with, he presents a very clear idea of what has motivated him to turn to this book in particular. Unlike Hrabanus, he had no project to cover the whole Bible. On the contrary, he only composed two major commentaries, on Lamentations and Matthew, both of which are developed treatments (but especially the latter).⁸¹ He had, therefore, an interest specifically in this text. Lamentations was selected for a specific reason.

In his opening address to Odilmannus Severus, he claims that old age has afflicted him with illnesses and that he is sick of life. Later, he speaks of how it is the duty of Odilmannus and himself to apply themselves to lamenting and to grieve their own sins and those of others.⁸² For Paschasius, then, the genre and aims of Lamentations are paramount. These poems are comparable to the Song of Songs, since they are the Lamentation of Lamentations.⁸³ Paschasius sets out the different purposes of lament, believing Lamentations to be above all about the repentance of sinners and the grief of all the saints. One laments in this life in order to rejoice in the future life.⁸⁴ He signals other laments in the Old Testament (and New in one instance): that on Saul, Jonathan and Absalom, Ezechiel laments,

⁷⁸ Given Paschasius's later influence, it must be the case that there were many more manuscripts in circulation than the nine enumerated by Paulus in his edition of the work (pp.vi-xii).

⁷⁹ Book 18, preface (PL 111, 1181D); Hugh comments on this treatment of Lamentations as a book separate to Jeremiah in the *Didascalicon*, 4.9 (PL 176, 784B), adapting Jerome, *In libros Samuel et Malachim* (PL 28, col. 554A-B): 'Certain persons, counting the history of Ruth and Jeremiah as separate and distinct books among the hagiographical writings, and adding these two to the twenty-two already mentioned, total twenty-four books of the Old Law - a number which symbolizes the twenty-four Elders who in the Apocalypse adore the Lamb.'

⁸⁰ On 1.1 (PL 120, 1063C-D).

⁸¹ *Expositio in Matheo libri XII*, CCCM 56-56A-56B (Turnhout, 1984).

⁸² Address in his prologue to the commentary on Lamentations 2 (PL 120, col. 1104B).

⁸³ Preface to *In Lamentationes* (PL 120, col. 1061B).

⁸⁴ PL 120, 1062B.

as does Peter. But he differentiates Lamentations for being a universal lament, in that the specific refers to the general.⁸⁵ In particular, Paschasius's contemporary Church is being grieved, along with the captivity of this life. Jeremiah laments the past, present, and future, just as we bewail the past destruction of Jerusalem, as well as the Church's defects in the present and the dangers faced by many souls in the future;⁸⁶ hence, his threefold scheme of the historical, allegorical and tropological senses.⁸⁷ The theme of lament recurs, and, I would argue, is very much a monastic *topos*. Grieving is seen to be a function of the religious vocation. Tears are shed for various reasons: to wash oneself clean of sin internally and externally in order to be reformed afresh, or on behalf of those who are caught up in secular life.⁸⁸ Such a monastic preoccupation is to be expected from this ex-abbot of Corbie. Hrabanus, an even greater leading light for monks, also included references to their life and purpose.⁸⁹

These two Carolingian writers may have shared the concerns of the cloister. But Paschasius's commentary has a distinctive focus. He presents the chorus of saints in heaven grieving over the sinful state of his contemporary Church, because there is hardly anyone within the Church itself who will take on this task. The Church as a whole is in disarray, assailed inside and out by sin and destruction. As we shall see, his obsession with this theme is a special characteristic of his particular treatment of Lamentations.

iii. Twelfth-century commentaries on Lamentations

From the early twelfth century onwards, commenting upon Lamentations became more common. Studies and composition in general were flourishing, particularly in the area of biblical exegesis; hence, the project exemplified by the *Glossa ordinaria*, to provide standardized glosses to cover the entire Bible. This undertaking had as its goal the selection and establishment of authoritative

⁸⁵ Ibid., 1061D-1062D.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 1063B.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 1063D-1064A: in fact, Paschasius, as de Lubac points out (*L'Exégèse biblique*, I.1.p.148) employs the four senses, thus including the anagogical sense.

⁸⁸ On 1.2 (*PL* 120, col. 1067A-D).

⁸⁹ For example, on 2.18. (*PL* 111, 1212C).

interpretations (and presentation of some divergent ones too, in this age of growing dialectic). These were set out distinctively, continuous comment placed around the biblical text, and actual words of this text glossed between the lines. The *Glossa ordinaria* resulted from a task of compilation, not one of fresh composition. Thus, in the case of Lamentations, Gilbert the Universal drew for the most part upon Paschasius's own commentary. But there are original interpretations of Lamentations predating or contemporaneous with Gilbert's, by Guibert of Nogent (1053-1124),⁹⁰ Rupert of Deutz (c.1075-1129),⁹¹ Hervé of Bourg-Dieu (c.1080-c.1150),⁹² Pseudo-William of Malmesbury (first half of twelfth century)⁹³ and an anonymous short exposition of Lamentations 1, falsely attributed to Jerome.⁹⁴ With the exception of Hugh and Gilbert the Universal, who later became Bishop of London, the identifiable authors were monks.

Gilbert's gloss was, then, directly derived from Paschasius. That ascribed to William of Malmesbury claims to be an epitome of the commentary by the latter, but is in fact a separate work.⁹⁵ Guibert's and Rupert's expositions, however, though inheriting ideas from Paschasius, have distinctive aspects. Their commentaries are not separate treatments, but fall within larger works. Guibert includes a tropological interpretation of Lamentations in *Tropologiae in prophetis*,⁹⁶ while Rupert's commentary is part of his *magnum opus*, *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius*.⁹⁷

⁹⁰ *Tropologiae in prophetis*, PL 156, cols 449D-488C.

⁹¹ *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius*, 29.12-89, ed. by H. Haacke, CCCM 23 (Turnhout, 1972).

⁹² According to F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi* (Madrid, 1951) III, p.46, no. 3261, it is contained in one manuscript, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 11562, ff.86-144; incipit: 'Captiuitas animarum populi Dei; explicit: '...si uos filius liberauerit, uere libere eritis (Joh. 8:36). Qui cum patre etc.' I have as yet been unable to consult this manuscript. It would be interesting to study it, given that Hervé of Bourg-Dieu was a prolific exegete, expounding in addition to Lamentations Deuteronomy, Judges, Ruth, Tobit, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, the twelve Minor Prophets and the Pauline Epistles.

⁹³ Stegmüller, *Repertorium*, II, p.416, no.1916: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 868, ff.1-126; incipit: 'Sepe monuisti, ut stilum diu feriatum'; explicit: 'ut excitet desiderium et prestat auxilium, Iesus Christus, Dominus noster.'

⁹⁴ PL 25, cols 787-792.

⁹⁵ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 868, f.1^{rb}. I have only had the opportunity to read the opening folios of this commentary. It deserves further study, as it seems to me to offer much of interest. It is the sole work contained in the twelfth-century manuscript (whose provenance was Worcester Cathedral Library, possibly in the fourteenth century), filling 126 folios.

⁹⁶ PL 56, cols 341A-487C.

⁹⁷ 'In Hieremiam' is in fact Book 29 of *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius*, ed. R. Haacke, CCCM 21-29 (Turnhout, 1971-2).

Guibert's moral reading of Lamentations accompanies a tropological exposition of Hosea and Amos, or in another version in circulation, of several other minor prophets as well.⁹⁸ Thus, Lamentations is detached from its context of the Major Prophets and presented as a lesser book, illustrating a certain flexibility in how it was viewed during this period. Guibert has very clear aims in interpreting it. He is solely concerned with its tropological sense, as is the case for his major exegetical work, the *Moralia* on Genesis.⁹⁹ For him, Jeremiah is comparing the misfortunes of Jerusalem to the fall of 'the interior man'.¹⁰⁰ He is concerned with its moralizing application most probably in relation to monastic life, focusing on the struggle against vices and earthly desires, and the evil afflictions these impose. Although there are echoes of Paschasius, Guibert's reading abounds in interpretations which differ from his ninth-century predecessor. To cite but three examples, God's footstool in 2:1 represents the 'blessed flesh of Christ'¹⁰¹ (whereas Paschasius's tropological interpretation imparts no symbolism to 'scabellum', but rather to God's feet representing the imprints of teachings);¹⁰² the liver of 2:11 is the seat of love¹⁰³ (whereas Paschasius understands it as the fires of lust);¹⁰⁴ the open mouth of 2:16 is the biting conscience¹⁰⁵ (whereas Paschasius takes it to be referring to many bad things being said against us, because of our sinfulness).¹⁰⁶ Guibert's interpretations of the Hebrew letters also differ, at least for Lamentations 1, where he does not employ the meanings adopted by Paschasius (and ultimately deriving from Jerome), but instead uses those from a different tradition, as represented by Ambrose in his commentary on Psalm 118.¹⁰⁷

Rupert of Deutz also inherited ideas from Paschasius, but is highly individual in his exposition of Lamentations. The massive work within which this

⁹⁸ The transmission of this work is a complicated business. See R. B. C. Huygens, 'La Tradition manuscrite de Guibert de Nogent', *Instrumenta patristica*, XXI (1991) pp.66-80.

⁹⁹ *PL* 156, cols 19C-338C.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 449D.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 459C.

¹⁰² *PL* 120, 1107D.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 463A.

¹⁰⁴ *PL* 120, 1127C-D.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 464C.

¹⁰⁶ *PL* 120, 1133B.

¹⁰⁷ See below p. 196-7.

is set is, strictly speaking, neither a work of systematic theology nor one of exegesis, but has features of both, concerned as it is with the history of salvation as seen imprinted on the Scriptures, which are given a Trinitarian structure. Books 27-32 are taken up with expositions of the Major Prophets, of which one book is entitled 'In Hieremiam'. But less than a third of this book is devoted to Jeremiah. Rupert breaks off from this text at Jeremiah 23:5-6.¹⁰⁸ At this point, Lamentations takes centre stage. For him these poems represent the true *scientia* of this Prophet.¹⁰⁹

Both Rupert and Guibert preface their expositions by a discussion of the significance of the four alphabets (of Lamentations 1-4). But whereas the latter then goes on to expound all five poems, the former treats just four, as if they constituted a unit. Rupert imposes a fourfold thematic structure where each of these acrostic poems has a separate theme or 'cause' for lament.¹¹⁰ Lamentations 1 has a universal cause for lament, because it concerns the captivity which has afflicted the human race since original sin; Lamentations 2 has as its cause for lament the captivity of God's chosen people in Babylon; Lamentations 3 has as its cause the humility of conscience of a saintly man, who laments his shared captivity with men and his own particular exile from God; the fourth poem's cause for lament is the worst of all, since it stems from the final fall and scattering of the Jewish people through their dire sinfulness, as embodied in their killing of Christ.

Rupert is unique in adopting such a scheme. In doing so, he departs from the traditional method of reading the text following the order of the senses. Naturally, he makes literal, allegorical, tropological and even anagogical interpretations, but it is his theme, not the practice of exposition, which determines the shape of the commentary. Just as his exegesis of much of the Bible in *De Trinitate* is set within the Trinitarian framework of religious history, so his exposition of Lamentations conforms to an ordered arrangement, with each book corresponding to a specific theme. Thus, the role of exegete and theologian become interlinked.

¹⁰⁸ *De Trinitate et operibus eius*, 29.11.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.: 'Lamentationes prophetarum huius sancti et sapientis ueram esse scientiam arbitremur.' ('Let us judge Lamentations to be the true *science / study* of this holy and wise Prophet.').

¹¹⁰ *De sancta Trinitate*, 29.12.

These two examples of commentaries dating from the early twelfth century bear witness to the fact that this book of the Bible lent itself to distinctive treatments, at least before the *Gloss* established Paschasius's work as the standard authority.¹¹¹ But there are certain central features which both the Carolingian and early twelfth-century commentaries share, but which Hugh's commentary omits. In these, Lamentations are interpreted in full;¹¹² Hugh only takes Lamentations 1:1-3 and the whole of Lamentations 2. They all contain a prologue before each poem; Hugh only has a brief prologue to Lamentations 2. They all include references to the meanings of the Hebrew letters;¹¹³ Hugh makes no reference whatsoever to the presence of these letters or to their significance in relation to the text, despite referring to them in the *Didascalicon*.¹¹⁴ Moreover, Hugh offers the fullest interpretations of each verse.¹¹⁵ Admittedly, unlike the works of the other commentators, his was only a partial exposition, and therefore left him scope for a more elaborated discussion of particular lines. But it does result in a deeper involvement with the text and one which, as we shall see, allowed Hugh to develop particular themes. Nonetheless, despite the unique features of his *Super Lamentationes*, there can be no doubt of Hugh's indebtedness to Paschasius Radbertus.

iv. Paschasius Radbertus as Source

I have argued above that Paschasius Radbertus's commentary on Lamentations was drawn upon in varying degrees by twelfth-century commentators. Hugh's *Super Lamentationes* was no exception in being informed by the work of his ninth-century predecessor. One modern scholar has enumerated at length the influence of Paschasius on Hugh.¹¹⁶ Nevertheless, much of Hugh's commentary

¹¹¹ I have not looked at commentaries which postdate the *Gloss*.

¹¹² Not quite in the case of Rupert of Deutz, but he sees himself as undertaking a project in dealing with the four acrostic poems as though they formed a unit.

¹¹³ This applies also to the two commentaries not discussed here, namely those of Hervé of Bourg-Dieu and Pseudo-William of Malmesbury.

¹¹⁴ See quotation above on p.24. This, as we shall see, clearly prompted one or more copyist to supply them himself before Hugh's commentary. See below pp. 192-214.

¹¹⁵ A possible exception is the commentary attributed to William of Malmesbury, which has very full interpretations of each verse.

¹¹⁶ Pollitt, 'Hugh as Biblical Exegete', pp.238-68.

was his own, and there are significant differences between *Super Lamentationes* and its Carolingian source. In this section, I will consider the relationship between the two, noting in particular where Hugh differs from his ninth-century predecessor.

Before highlighting differences, it is best to cite the main points of contact between them. Most importantly, Hugh adopts the threefold scheme of exegesis from Paschasius, and in fact applies it more rigorously. On occasions, Paschasius takes all three senses together, embracing them all in one sentence,¹¹⁷ whereas Hugh never merges the three senses in this way. He too devotes most attention to the allegorical and tropological ideas of Jerusalem as Church and soul respectively. There are many details in particular interpretations which he adopts from Paschasius: the horn of 2:3 tropologically representing the human potential for virtue;¹¹⁸ God's removal of His special gifts from the Jewish people and His handing them over to the gentiles;¹¹⁹ the gates of Jerusalem as the *doctores* of the Jewish people.¹²⁰ Parallels abound, though actual verbal echoes are fairly limited and occasional.¹²¹ Furthermore, they are often superficial. Hugh takes an idea from Paschasius as his starting-point and develops it into his own interpretation of the text. This affects both the specific details of expositions of verses and the general sense of direction of the commentary. Let us consider some examples.

The opening of Hugh's commentary at once evokes Paschasius. Hugh focuses on the stylistic power of the exclamation 'How desolate sits the city so full of people'. He ascribes the expression to a prophet who is amazed or grieving: 'et est admirantis vel dolentis vox ista.'¹²² This echoes Paschasius's comment on 1:1: 'vehemens exclamatio...plena fletibus, plena doloribus, plena omni admiratione et stupore moerentis.'¹²³ Paschasius repeats the thought in his discussion of 2:1 and 2:6, in the latter instance, actually using the present participles 'dolentis et admirantis'.¹²⁴ A little further on in his literal interpretation

¹¹⁷ For example, on 2.15 and 16 (PL 120, 1132B and 1133B).

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 1111B.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 1115C. Paschasius is here quoting from Hrabanus.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 1122B. Paschasius is here quoting from Hrabanus.

¹²¹ See the source apparatus to my edition.

¹²² PL 175, 255D.

¹²³ PL 120, 1063C.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 1116B.

of 1:1, Hugh uses the term ‘exaggeratio’, which Paschasius himself employs with reference to this verse.¹²⁵ In the allegorical interpretation, Paschasius writes of the Church being abandoned by angels and laid waste by enemies inside and out.¹²⁶ Hugh adopts this idea. The enemies within and without are pinpointed: the ‘gentes’ are the ‘carnales’ inside the Church; the ‘provinces’ are the pagans, Jews and heretics outside it.¹²⁷ Moreover, Hugh employs the marital image which arises from ‘quasi vidua’, not to elaborate the Church’s relationship with her husband Christ, but to describe the special connection between the Jewish people and God.¹²⁸ These are striking resonances, which would indicate a clear indebtedness to Paschasius. But the resemblances in their respective interpretations of this verse go no further. From the outset, Paschasius emphasizes the wickedness of the Jewish people and gives prominence to the future, more lethal attack of the Romans. Hugh is concerned with the extent of the calamity of 586 BC for the Jewish people and its lamentability in the hope that the enormity of their suffering will prompt listeners to repent for their own sins. He does not make the destruction of 586 BC of lesser significance than that of AD 70. He does not here even mention the latter. Rather, he focuses on the awful aspects of the actual event: the former great city of David reduced to this state, its once highly favoured people, who had enjoyed a special union with God, serving those who had previously served them. He only refers once to the fact that they had ‘offended’ God,¹²⁹ and his use of this word is a far cry from Paschasius’s strong language, for the latter does not mince his words - ‘scelestus populus’: for him, the ‘perfida gens Iudaea’ were finally punished because of their killing of Christ.¹³⁰ In Paschasius’s eyes, the capture of 586 BC simply prefigures this later and worse destruction by Titus and Vespasian.

Paschasius may give little attention to the terrible nature of this event in the Old Testament. But he does include specific historical detail, with his reference to the fact that Jerusalem was not completely deserted, because some

¹²⁵ Ibid., 1063D.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 1064D.

¹²⁷ *PL* 175, 257D.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 257A.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 258D.

¹³⁰ *PL* 120, cols 1063C, 1063D.

remained behind.¹³¹ He also speaks of the capture of the ten tribes by the Assyrians, with the two tribes of the House of David staying behind, later to be captured by the Chaldeans. Hugh has only the vaguest historical detail, his aim being to create a general sense of the overwhelming misery.

Another example of Hugh's reworking of an idea taken from Paschasius is very revealing. On the allegorical significance of 2:6, both refer to the Church and Synagogue. Hugh even shares with Paschasius a biblical citation from the Song of Songs (4:12).¹³² But their concerns here could not be more different. Paschasius is attacking his contemporary Church, which he compares to the Synagogue. The tent represents the Synagogue in its wickedness or the Church in its error. The sinful members of both are expelled from Paradise. Christians who turn to carnal desires will be punished no less severely than the Jews were when they succumbed to pleasure, sighing for the delights of Egypt and Sodom, as evoked by the garden simile in the biblical text.¹³³ On the contrary, Hugh sets up a striking contrast between the Church and Synagogue. He interprets the verses not as referring to a sinful Church, but as directed at the Synagogue, whose people have been deprived of their special relationship with God and scattered by the Romans on account of their wickedness in killing Christ.¹³⁴ He too dwells upon the garden analogy. But for him, it represents the barrenness of the Synagogue, which has lost its fruit of righteousness, while emphasizing the fertility of the Church; the former is the 'scattered' garden of Isaiah 1:18, the latter is the enclosed garden of the Song of Songs 4:12.¹³⁵

What this comparison reveals is that these two may have shared certain basic features, but that they applied this common material in radically different ways. They each had their own particular preoccupations. Let us consider their broad differences. Both give much space to the theme of their contemporary Church. For Paschasius, it becomes the central concern of the commentary, with the literal interpretation serving to support his onslaught. On occasion, he compares the state of the Church to that of the Old Testament Jews, even stating

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 1064C.

¹³² Paschasius: *PL* 120, col. 1116D; Hugh: *PL* 175, col. 275B.

¹³³ *PL* 120, cols 1116D-1117A.

¹³⁴ *PL* 175, col. 275A.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 275B-C.

in places that things will turn out a lot worse for the former.¹³⁶ He presents his whole Church as being defiled and assailed both inside and outside by enemies (sinners, heretics, bad priests, even invaders whose attacks are deserved by churches because of their defects). At one stage, he speaks of the Church as if it were an individual soul, thus emphasizing the idea that it is the Church as a whole entity that he is upbraiding.¹³⁷ In another place, he speaks of its insanity, blindness and fall.¹³⁸ According to Paschasius, the obligatory citation of Christ's lament (Luke 19:41-4) on the predicted destruction of Jerusalem applies to the Church, whereas, for Hugh, it refers to the future punishment of the Jewish people.¹³⁹ For Paschasius, the Church's affliction has a general cause: its sinfulness. He scarcely specifies any other causes, aside from brief references to heretics, bad priests etc. Hugh also criticizes his contemporary Church, but does not present the whole body as defective, rather certain parts of it. He develops the theme of its enemies, devoting much more space, as we shall see, to the question of wicked prelates and dangerous heretics.

Paschasius may have been attacking the Church of his time, but he constantly harks back to its previous special relationship with Christ, drawing a parallel with the former glory of Jerusalem. The Song of Songs, in Paschasius's view the counterpart to Lamentations, underlies the whole text. Quotations from it abound, with some of them elaborated in their own right. The Church is the betrothed who, through her adultery, has lost her husband. The ever-presence of this other Old Testament text is a distinctive feature of Paschasius's commentary. There are other biblical references (some of which he shares with Hrabanus), for example, Moses' leprous hand and Job. Hugh's text, although of course drawing on parallels from elsewhere in the Scriptures, does not have such underlying connections.

The above examples serve to demonstrate how distinct these two interpretations are, despite some shared elements. That Paschasius's and Hugh's commentaries differ is not surprising. They were both products of their age. Thus,

¹³⁶ For example, *PL* 120, cols 1134A-B, 1139A.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, cols 1066D-67A.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 1130A.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 1121A/B.

Paschasius has references to invasions, strife and the ravages of war in the form of devastated churches, as well as to contemporary idolatry (by which he is surely referring to paganism). His gloomy view of the state of the Church was probably shaped by the instability of that institution in a time of great upheaval. Hugh's main concerns, as we shall see, also relate to preoccupations particular to his age.

II. Hugh's Interpretation of Lamentations

1. Threefold Interpretation

Hugh followed Paschasius in adopting a threefold scheme for interpreting Lamentations: first the literal (or historical) sense, then the allegorical (or mystical), and finally the tropological (or moral). The *Glossa ordinaria* inherited the same structure from Paschasius, but changed the order of the senses, placing tropology before allegory. Paschasius himself did not religiously conform to a fixed order of the three, at times interpreting a verse according to two or even all three senses at once.¹⁴⁰

At first sight, Hugh is quite rigid in complying with the threefold construction and in keeping the different senses apart. His treatment of Lamentations 1:1-3 could almost be described as a model, an *exercice de style*, in the threefold exposition. The different senses are often signposted by introductory phrases. Thus on 1:1, we find the following: 'Quantum ad litteram spectat', 'Secundum allegorie sensum', 'Secundum intellectum moralem'; on 1:2, just the allegorical and moral senses are indicated: 'Secundum sensum allegorie,' 'Secundum moralem sensum;' on 1:3, only the allegorical sense, by the word 'Mystice'. It is as if Hugh includes these signposts to enable his audience to grow used to this method of interpretation, and then gradually discards them.

No such phrases are used in his commentary on Lamentations 2, though the moral interpretation of 2:6 opens with a more cumbersome expression: 'Si autem ea que supradicta sunt ad moralem sensum convertimus' ('But if we apply the moral sense to what has been said above...'). Such an indication might be thought necessary here, since the whole threefold scheme breaks down in the opening section of the exposition of Lamentations 2. Hugh first presents a literal interpretation of 2:1-9, then for 2:1-5 gives a 'spiritual' reading which encompasses both the mystical and the moral realms, and then for 2:6-7 alternates these two as distinct senses. At 2:8 he resumes the threefold structure again, and maintains this until the end of his commentary which finishes with an exposition of

¹⁴⁰ See footnote 117.

the final verse of Lamentations 2, reversing, however, the order of the literal and allegorical readings of 2:11.¹⁴¹ For all of his interpretation of Lamentations 1 and over half of that of Lamentations 2, Hugh maintains the threefold structure.

Applying the threefold scheme for interpretation was a natural method to adopt for this text. The primary subject-matter lent itself particularly well to this type of exposition, with Jerusalem as the major city of biblical history, while at the same time symbolizing both the Church and Christian soul. But such a method of reading the Bible has an added relevance to Hugh, given that the threefold understanding of the Bible is how Hugh categorizes *lectio divina*, both in his *Didascalicon* and *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris*.¹⁴² He does not, however, prescribe the threefold exposition as the way in which the whole Bible should be interpreted, acknowledging that some parts of the Scriptures are best read according to one particular interpretation.¹⁴³ Thus, in his other works of line-by-line exegesis, Hugh confined himself to the literal interpretation for the Pentateuch and for Ecclesiastes. But with Lamentations, we can see in action his manner of interpreting according to the three major senses that form the backbone of his teachings on Bible study.

The focus of this chapter is Hugh's literal and allegorical interpretations of Lamentations. His tropological exposition is not discussed in depth, but has been left for future study.

¹⁴¹ See below p.272.

¹⁴² *Didascalicon*, 5.2 (PL 176, cols 789C-790B); *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris*, 3 (PL 175, 11D-12C).

¹⁴³ *Didascalicon*, Ibid. (PL 176, col. 789C-D), where Hugh quotes Isidore, *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum*, *Praefatio* 4 (PL 82, col. 208); *De scripturis*, Ibid. (12D-13A). Cf. Augustine, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 22.24 (PL 42, col. 463).

2. Tropological Interpretation

Hugh devotes little space to discussing the tropological sense in the *Didascalicon*, his main point being that contemplation of God's creation informs morals and promotes *operatio*:

De tropologia nihil aliud in praesenti dicam, quam quod supra dictum est, excepto quod ad eam magis rerum quam vocum significatio pertinere videtur. In illa enim naturalis iustitia est, ex qua disciplina morum nostrorum, id est positiva iustitia nascitur. Contemplando quid fecerit Deus, quid nobis faciendum sit, agnoscimus. Omnis natura Deum loquitur. Omnis natura hominem docet. Omnis natura rationem parit, et nihil in universitate infecundum est.¹⁴⁴

Concerning tropology I shall not at present say anything more than what was said above, except that it is more the meaning of things than the meaning of words which seems to pertain to it. For in the meaning of things lies natural justice, out of which the discipline of our own morals, that is, positive justice arises. By contemplating what God has made, we realize what we ourselves ought to do. Every nature tells of God; every nature teaches man; every nature reproduces its essential form, and nothing in the universe is infecund.¹⁴⁵

In *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris*, Hugh nowhere uses the word 'tropologia' or its relative forms.¹⁴⁶ Confusingly, this third sense is described as 'anagoge' and classed as a subsection of 'allegoria'. It is defined as making clear an invisible thing by means of a visible thing'.¹⁴⁷ This definition seems rather abstract. However, the example Hugh gives to illustrate the three senses clarifies the application of this third element.¹⁴⁸ He takes the figure of Job and shows how the actual figure sitting and suffering in the dungheap falls into the category of the historical sense. Allegorically, Job represents Christ descending into the dungheap

¹⁴⁴ *Didascalicon*, 6.5 (PL 176, col. 805B-C).

¹⁴⁵ Taylor draws a parallel in his endnotes (p.224, n.22) between the effects of natural justice here and God's intentions as formulated in *De sacramentis*, 1.1.3 (PL 176, cols 188C-189B).

¹⁴⁶ Nor does he use these in *Super Lamentationes*, where 'moralis' and its related words are preferred.

¹⁴⁷ PL 175, 12B. This is quoted below p.61.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 12B-C.

of this world to share in all our defects. The moral sense interprets Job as ‘the righteous man or penitent soul, which stores in its memory the dungheap of all the sins it has committed, and does not cease even for an hour to weep over this, sitting and meditating upon it’.¹⁴⁹

The accounts of the moral sense differ in these didactic works. The *Didascalicon* concentrates on the learning of right action, *De scripturis* upon the repentance for wrongdoing. It is the last of these that applies most of all to Hugh’s moral interpretation in *Super Lamentationes*, which focuses upon the lamentable effects of sinfulness on the individual’s soul.

The *topos* of the struggle of the soul against vice pervades Christian literature from the first centuries onwards, as exemplified by influential works such as the *Psychomachia* of Prudentius. The analogy between Jerusalem laid waste by its enemies and the soul assailed by sin and evil is commonplace, especially in commentaries on Lamentations.¹⁵⁰ Hugh’s own moral interpretation conforms closely with that of Paschasius, even at times echoing the phraseology of the latter.¹⁵¹ It belongs firmly within a tradition which derives most notably from Gregory the Great, especially in his *Moralia in Iob*. This tradition revolves around the individual’s fight against sin and his ascent towards communion with God, highlighting the dangers to avoid and the practices to nurture: the carnal desires, bodily senses, temptation, vices and demons to be combatted by means of conscience, compunction, repentance, self-mortification, virtues, faith, good action, contemplation and love and fear of God.

Hugh’s treatment of the soul’s confrontation with vices is marked at times by a certain systematization, a tendency to present a *ratio* or quasi-science concerned with the make-up of the soul within and its interaction with the world outside. Hence, explanations of the processes of the mind abound: how the senses

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 12C: ‘Job quemlibet justum vel animam poenitentem potest significare, quae componit in memoria sua sterquilinum ex omnibus peccatis quae fecit, et non ad horam, sed perseveranter super hoc sedendo et meditando flere non cessat.’

¹⁵⁰ F. L. Battles, ‘Hugo of Saint Victor as a Moral Allegorist’, *Church History* 18 (1949), p.233: ‘the ancient tropological interpretation of the tragic history of Jerusalem has changed but little from Origen to Hugh.’

¹⁵¹ See source apparatus for 272A-B, 274A-B.

of the body have different *motus* and *operationes*;¹⁵² how *cogitationes* originate from *affectus*;¹⁵³ how vices take root.¹⁵⁴

Hugh develops certain tropological interpretations at length, such as his elaborate treatment of the ill-effects of carnal desires, as illustrated by Samson.¹⁵⁵ The most striking example of a theme discussed in full comes in the section concerning Lamentations 2:14, where types of wrong thinking are exemplified: one type of thinking urges vengeance when one is wronged, another gluttony, a third the acquisition of wealth, a fourth the concealment of one's wrongdoings to preserve reputation. Hugh brings his treatment alive by presenting the arguments of these 'false prophets' and then countering them. The whole aptly demonstrates how he can take up a topic and develop it, unconstrained by the exegetical framework within which he is operating. This, as we shall see, characterizes his allegorical interpretation.

The moral interpretation has greater importance in the exposition of Lamentations 1:1-3 than in that of Lamentations 2, as though these were distinct compositions. We shall see further differences in the treatments of these two parts with regard to the other two senses.

¹⁵² 258B (From here on, all references to *Super Lamentationes* will simply give a column reference to *PL* 175).

¹⁵³ 290D.

¹⁵⁴ 288D.

¹⁵⁵ 263C-D.

3. Literal Interpretation

i. Theory

In Book Six of the *Didascalicon*, Hugh devotes a lengthy chapter to the literal or historical sense.¹⁵⁶ Before a student can move on to an allegorical reading of the Scriptures, he should be well-grounded in its foundation, history. He uses the commonplace metaphor of the senses as an edifice, with history as the foundation upon which the structure of allegory was built. In another metaphor, history is also the honeycomb from which the honey of allegory is extracted.¹⁵⁷ He first defines history as ‘what has been done, when it has been done, where it has been done and by whom it has been done, ... the person, the business done, the time and the place’,¹⁵⁸ a definition which brings to mind the fact tables of the *Chronicon* (in the form of temple facades to serve as an *aide-mémoire*). He justifies the importance of a detailed knowledge of biblical events at some length, maintaining that even those facts which seem of little importance may well turn out to be highly relevant when viewed within their whole context. Those details which are not of interest in themselves must nevertheless be studied for the light they shed on other things, for ‘nothing is superfluous’.¹⁵⁹ Moreover, biblical history enables man ‘to admire God’s deeds’.¹⁶⁰ From the Creation to Judgement Day, history teaches us about God: ‘See how, from the time when the world began until the end of the ages, the mercies of God do not slacken.’¹⁶¹ This remark, which closes the chapter on the historical sense, is preceded by an actual potted history of God’s dealings with humankind, pinpointing key moments, among which naturally figures the captivity of the Jewish people in Babylon at the hand of Nabuchodonosor.

¹⁵⁶ *Didascalicon*, 6.3 (PL 176, 799B-802A).

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 801C.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 799B.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 800D-801A.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 801D.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 802A.

Hugh lists certain books of the Bible which are suited to an historical interpretation. But he states that the whole Bible can be interpreted according to a broader meaning of 'historical':

If we take the meaning of the word more broadly, it is not unfitting that we call by the name 'history' not only the recounting of actual deeds but also the first meaning of any narrative which uses the words according to their proper nature.¹⁶²

He adds the proviso that some parts of the Scriptures cannot be understood literally.

Hugh further elucidates the literal sense in his discussion of biblical exposition at the end of the *Didascalicon*.¹⁶³ Here he distinguishes between the letter (*littera*) and sense (*sensus*). Interpretation according to the letter involves pinpointing the precise meaning of the words on the page, and belongs to the sphere of 'grammar': a word is supplied where this is necessary; or stripped away where there is an excess; the order changed; the sentence parsed. In short, one construes a verse of ^{the}Scripture when one expounds the letter. When the words mean something which seems nonsensical, it should not be assumed that no literal interpretation is possible. Rather, it may be necessary to understand the idiom and context of the passage, as these may well be alien to the medieval reader. This is not equivalent to a figurative reading of the verse, but does imply that at times the literal sense involves some probing and lateral thinking.

His later treatise on biblical exegesis has a more condensed definition of this sense, likewise seeing it as having a specific meaning as actual history, as well as a broader compass, and underlining a special characteristic of the words of the Scriptures:

Prima expositio est historica, in qua consideratur prima verborum significatio ad res ipsas de quibus agitur. Habet enim sacrum eloquium proprietatem quamdam ab aliis scripturis differentem, quod in eo primum per verba quae recitantur de

¹⁶² Ibid., 801A.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 6.8-10. (PL 176, cols 806D-808C).

rebus quibusdam agitur, quae rursum res vice verborum ad significationem aliarum rerum proponuntur.¹⁶⁴

The first exposition is historical, which considers the primary meanings of words in relation to the actual things to which they refer. For sacred speech has a certain special character which differs from that of other writings, because the words which are expressed first refer to certain things, which in turn are used to signify other things in lieu of words.

The literal level of understanding thus aims to uncover the meaning of the objects referred to by language, which objects are themselves signifiers.

ii. Application in *Super Lamentationes*

a. History

In Hugh's analysis of biblical exposition, the literal sense in time-honoured fashion covers the events of history and the meaning of words. The literal interpretation of Lamentations is, broadly speaking, more concerned with the meaning and force of words rather than the narration of events. This should come as no surprise. In the *Didascalicon*, the Prophets are not listed as books which lend themselves to an historical reading.¹⁶⁵ Nonetheless, the destruction of Jerusalem and more particularly the subsequent seventy-year exile in Babylon signify, as already remarked, a keypoint in the grand scheme of biblical history. In *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris*, where Hugh repeats the traditional six ages of human existence, the transmigration into Babylon marks the end of the fourth age.¹⁶⁶

In *Super Lamentationes*, Hugh presents the events lamented as an historical reality, with Jeremiah an actual figure and Jerusalem the Holy City of the Old Testament, once powerful and favoured by God, but now laid waste, its people subjugated to foreign rule and exiled in an alien land. But factual details of the happenings are skimmed over. The enemy is named as the Chaldaeans (and later the Romans), and Babylon is identified as the place of exile. At the end of the

¹⁶⁴ *De scripturis*, 3 (PL 175, cols 11D-12A).

¹⁶⁵ *Didascalicon*, 6.3 (803B).

¹⁶⁶ PL 175, col. 24B.

commentary, a reference is made in passing to the fact that some people remained behind. The only developed example of an actual event is where Hugh mentions Sedechias's defeat near Jericho and his subsequent captivity in Babylon where he witnesses the slaughter of his sons before himself being blinded.¹⁶⁷ Apart from this detail, Hugh speaks only in general terms about the events. We have already contrasted this vagueness with the greater precision of Paschasius's work, in which there are specific references to details such as who remained in Judea, Titus and Vespasian (rather than just 'Romans'), Josephus as source, the prophecy from the book of Jeremiah on the destruction of the Temple, and the Jewish custom of lamenting. Hugh omits such historical references. It is possibly no accident that the word 'historialiter' or 'historice' occurs nowhere in *Super Lamentationes*.

b. Letter

In his literal interpretation, it is very much the interpretation of the letter which interests Hugh. Thus, we find such phrases as 'quantum ad litteram spectat', 'secundum litteram' and 'quantum ad litteram pertinent, tres sunt uigilie noctis'. His literal interpretation has a double aspect, meaning and style. Hugh puts into practice his analysis of the literal exposition as set forth in his discursive works on exegesis, where this sense is partly applied to the primary meaning of the words. On a basic level, he helps the reader construe the verses, supplying a verb where one is needed,¹⁶⁸ and distinguishing phrases or connecting them.¹⁶⁹ In a similar manner to the *Glossa ordinaria*, he glosses words: 'solam' is equivalent to 'desolatam';¹⁷⁰ 'sederunt' implies dejection.¹⁷¹ In the second of these examples, we find Hugh drawing out the figurative force of the language. Although he makes no reference to the poetic form and style of Lamentations, he does discuss the imagery used and the appropriateness of the diction. A few examples will suffice: the horn represents the strength of the leaders of the Jewish people; God's

¹⁶⁷ 319B.

¹⁶⁸ For example, 2:7 (268C).

¹⁶⁹ For example, 2:2 (265B-C); 2:8 (269B-C); 2:21 (316B).

¹⁷⁰ 1:1 (258D).

¹⁷¹ 2:10 (282D).

right hand signifies His protection;¹⁷² the metaphor of God aiming a bow is explained as increasing or delaying a threat;¹⁷³ the likening of God's anger to the flowing forth of fire is presented as being more suited to the expression of His intense anger than the simile of water flooding;¹⁷⁴ the strength of the verb 'precipitavit' is noted.¹⁷⁵ Thus, the literal interpretation involves a clarification of meaning, an explanation of imagery and a discussion of style.

c. Structure and Rhetoric

'Style' is a major theme of the primary sense. Rather than focusing upon *what* is lamented, Hugh is preoccupied with *how* it is lamented. In short, he aims to bring out the full force of Jeremiah's threnody. This is evident at the very opening of the commentary, where he immediately asserts that the Prophet employed rhetorical devices with a view to having the maximum effect on his audience. Jeremiah's objective is, according to Hugh, to arouse in this audience a full sense of the magnitude of the calamity, so that they themselves repent of their sinful ways. Jeremiah thus resembles an orator or preacher, who uses astonished exclamation, exaggeration and repetition to emphasize the plaint. In Lamentations 2, Jeremiah is shown to have structured his lament to achieve the greatest effect. He did not address those whose misfortune he was deploring, for fear of upsetting them too soon while their wounds were still fresh. Moreover, he organized his lament so that it rose to a crescendo, beginning with the least important things and ascending to the human suffering involved. He climbed up through stages of grief, so as not to overload with sorrow those who were already mourning, but also to stir up his audience's emotions gradually:

...nunc ipsius conquestionis ordinem inspiciamus. Primum quasi absentes plangit, quia eos qui in amaritudine erant, tam cito presenti allocutione sollicitare non debuit. Incipit quoque ea in primis que minima sunt plangere, ne animos merentium improuisi doloris pondus opprimat, sicque paulatim a minoribus

¹⁷² 2:3 (266A).

¹⁷³ 2:4 (266B-C).

¹⁷⁴ 266D-267A.

¹⁷⁵ 2:2 (265C)



ad maiora enumerando progrediens, sensim ad luctum excitat animos auditorum. Primum ergo luget depopulationem regionis, deinde destructionem edificiorum communium, deinde euersionem sacrarum edium, deinde contaminationem sanctorum, deinde a rebus inanimatis progreditur ad miseriam hominum, deiectionem scilicet et inopiam deplorandam, et sic tandem finit conquestionem suam.¹⁷⁶

...let us now observe the order of the actual lament. First he laments the people as if they were not there [i.e. without addressing them directly], because he had to avoid at once addressing those who were in the grip of bitterness, and thus distressing them so soon. Furthermore, he begins to lament at the beginning what is of least importance, to avoid overwhelming those who are mourning with sudden pain, and by gradually progressing in this way from lesser to greater things, he arouses his audience to grief slowly. First he grieves the devastation of the region, then the destruction of public buildings, then the razing of the sacred buildings, then the defilement of holy places, then he advances from inanimate things to bewail the human suffering, that is the dejection of the people and their helplessness, and ends his lament on that note.

Hugh actually signals every step up to a new degree of intensity, thus marking each stage of the lament as follows:

- On 2:1: 'Incipit ergo sicut supradictum est e longinquo plangere ipsam, scilicet regionem, ut tandem ad ipsum caput regionis Ierusalem perueniat.'¹⁷⁷

('He begins, then, as has been mentioned above, to lament from a distance [that daughter of Zion], that is the region, in order to arrive finally at that capital of the region, Jerusalem.')

- On 2:2:

Quod in precedenti clausula generaliter sub nomine terre premiserat, hoc hic per partes exsequitur: speciosa, munitiones, regnum, principes. Et uide quomodo lamentum crescit. Prius solummodo terram nominauerat, sed forte ipsa terra sterilis et

¹⁷⁶ 264D-265A.

¹⁷⁷ 265B.

inculta atque ideo minus plangenda putaretur, subsequenter de eius quoque opulentia et sublimitate lamentum conformat.¹⁷⁸

What he had said in the preceding verse under the general heading of 'earth', he here develops by referring to specific things: the beauty, defences, kingdom, princes. See how the lament rises. First he had only mentioned 'the earth', but in case that earth be thought barren and uncultivated and therefore less lamentable, he subsequently strengthens the lament by also pointing to its wealth and exalted status.

- On 2:5: 'Hucusque desolationem filie Sion, id est regionis Iudee planxisse uidetur. Nunc ad ipsam matrem Sion, scilicet Ierusalem, deplorandam se conuertit...' ¹⁷⁹

('Up to this point he seems to have lamented the devastation of the daughter of Zion, i.e. of the region of Judea. Now he turns to bewailing its actual mother, i.e. Jerusalem.')

- On 2:6: 'Nunc ad destructionem sacrarum edium deplorandam accedit.' ¹⁸⁰

('Now he reaches the point of bewailing the destruction of the buildings which are sacred.')

- On 2:7: 'Hic iam de contaminatione sanctorum agere incipit.' ¹⁸¹

('Here he begins to deal with the defilement of the holy places.')

- On 2:10: 'Hucusque quasi destructionem edificiorum descripsit, deinceps miseriam et dolorem hominum plangit.' ¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸ 265C.

¹⁷⁹ 267A-B.

¹⁸⁰ 267D.

¹⁸¹ 268D.

¹⁸² 282D.

(‘Up to this point he has described the destruction of buildings, then he laments the wretchedness and suffering of people.’)

- On 2:13: ‘Paulatim planctum promouet. Primum edificia, deinde homines et ipsos quasi absentes luxit. Nunc tandem uelut emollitis et assuefactis longo fletu animis ad presentes uerba conuertit...’¹⁸³

(‘He gradually intensifies his lament. First he grieved buildings, then people, but these as though they were not before him. Now he finally addresses his words to them directly, since they have now been softened by long weeping and have grown used to it.’)

Hugh thus ascribes to the prophet Jeremiah a conscious employment of oratorical structure to achieve the most intense emotions in his audience. Rhetoric clearly interests him. This is not the case for Paschasius, who was concerned with types of lament and the purpose of lament, but not with the style. Hugh’s preoccupation with this aspect of Lamentations is undoubtedly a sign of the times. His contemporary, Gilbert the Universal, though for the most part simply excerpting Paschasius’s work for his own gloss on Lamentations, added references to rhetorical features. His prologue to Lamentations 1 is devoted to this subject and employs terms belonging to this field (*oratio, demonstratio, elocutio, coniunctio, loci rhetorici, more rhetorico*). He alerts the reader to the stylistic qualities he should find for himself, assisting him by defining certain rhetorical categories, most notably *conquestio* and *indignatio*, both avowedly inherited from Cicero:¹⁸⁴

Rhetoricorum colorum splendorem et sententiarum grauitatem et elocutionis ornationem me tacente diligens lector non tacebit. Locorum quorum rhetoricorum multitudinem et dialecticorum raritatem et argumentorum subtilitatem gratis inueniet. Preterea et rhetorice *conquestionis* humilitatem et interdum *indignationis* asperitatem uel utriusque commixtionem^m nullo docente docebit.

¹⁸³ 291C.

¹⁸⁴ For *conquestio*, see *De inventione* 1.106, and *Ad Herennium* (the anonymous work closely related to the former and attributed to Cicero) 3.13. 24; for *indignatio*, see *De inventione* 1.98.

Rudibus tamen satisfaciendo, et conquestionem et indignationem rhetoricam propriis diffinitionibus ad medium deducere non grauabor. Est enim (ut ait Tullius) *conquestio*, oratio auditorum miseriam captans. Cuius primus locus est per quem quibus in bonis fuerimus et quibus malis nunc simus ostendimus, sicut hic: *Quomodo sedet sola ciuitas* etc. *Indignatio* est oratio per quam conficitur aut in hominem odium aut in rem offensio. Cuius primus locus est ab auctoritate cum dicitur: *Quante cure ea res fuerit diis immortalibus* etc. Sicut hic: *Candidiores Nazarei eius niue* etc. In primo ergo alphabeto paucos *conquestionis* et *indignationis* locos assignando, diligentiori et perspicaciori uiam aperio lectori.¹⁸⁵

My silence will not silence the careful reader,¹⁸⁶ in admiring the splendour of the rhetorical colours, the weight of the sentences, the flowers of speech. He will find for himself the number of heads of rhetoric, the choice of dialectic, the subtle arguments. He will teach, untaught, the abjectness of the rhetorical 'lamentation', the severity of the incitement to 'indignation', and the combination of both. In order to satisfy beginners, however, I shall not disdain to set forth the correct definition of rhetorical 'lamentation' and 'indignation'. 'Lamentation', as Tully says, is speech provoking the pity of the hearers. Its first head is that by which we show what happiness we had once and what misery we are in now, for example, *How doth the city sit solitary that was full of people* [Lam 1:1]. 'Indignation' is speech by which is professed either hate of a person or displeasure at an event: the first head is from authority, when it is said: 'What concern is this to the immortal gods?' Similarly here: *Her Nazarites were whiter than snow* [4:7].

I therefore initiate the more careful, penetrating reader by noting in the first alphabet a few heads of 'lamentation' and 'indignation'.¹⁸⁷

It is worth considering whether there is any common ground between Hugh and Gilbert in their application of rhetoric to Lamentations. Both are concerned with 'literary appreciation', with the colouring of the language used; both refer to the rhetorical category of *conquestio*, seeing its aim as being to arouse sorrow in the audience; both analyse the text according to rhetorical divisions. However, there are notable differences. Hugh does not use such a concentration of overtly

¹⁸⁵ *Glossa ordinaria in librum Threnorum*, in *Biblia Latina cum glossa ordinaria*, facsimile reprint of the *editio princeps* Adolph Rusch of Strassburg 1480/81, intro. by K. Froehlich and M. T. Gibson (Turnhout, 1992), III, p.1836.

¹⁸⁶ Of course, 'lector' here is likely to mean teacher (or preacher).

¹⁸⁷ Translated by Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, pp.69-70.

technical terminology. Moreover, his analysis of Lamentations 2 is more elaborate, with its structured escalation.

Most strikingly of all, Hugh does not mention just two rhetorical categories, but five, among which *indignatio* does not figure. His prologue to Lamentations 2 divides the poem into five sections, each falling under a heading:

2:1-12:	<i>conquestio</i>
2:13-16:	<i>increpatio</i>
2:17-mid-18:	<i>consolatio</i>
2:18(cont.d)-19:	<i>preceptio</i>
2:20-22:	<i>deprecatio</i>

Hugh could partly derive this partitioning of the text from comments of Paschasius, on 2:13, 2:18 and 2:20. The latter prefaces his interpretation on 2:13 as follows: ‘Quod quia gens illa noluit emolliri digne ad poenitentiam, plangentis affectu, propheta gemebundus ad ipsam Ierusalem, querelas suas convertit, dicens: *Cui comparabo te...*’¹⁸⁸ (‘Since that people did not wish to give way rightly to repentance, the grieving Prophet, with the feeling of one lamenting, turns his complaints to Jerusalem herself, saying: “To whom shall I compare you...”’) Perhaps this word *querela* suggested the idea of *increpatio* - ‘reproach’ - to Hugh.

In the middle of 2:18, at the same point where Hugh’s *preceptio* begins, Paschasius remarks on a change of direction:

Et notandum quod haec clausula versus, magis lege metri ad superiora quam ad sequentia respicit. Qui quoties uno nequeunt versu vel duobus explere sensum transponunt necessitate poetica, et in alterius medio aut principio, sensum conceptum explicant, et hinc est quod ad ipsam Ierusalem mox sermo vertitur: *Deduc quasi torrentem lacrimas per diem et noctem, non des requiem tibi, neque taceat pupilla oculi tui*. Multis propheta miseriarum expletis lamentis et enumeratis quae acciderant malis, vertit ad se ipsam, et hortatur quasi torrentem ad placandum Deum pro suis erratibus deducere lacrimas.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁸ PL 120, col. 1129C.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 1135B-C.

It should be noted that this line of the verse looks back according to the law of metre to what precedes it more than to what follows. Whenever men cannot fulfil the sense in one or two verses, they transpose it by poetic necessity, and make the sense clear in the middle of another verse or at the beginning, and this is why the words are now turned to Jerusalem herself: 'Pour down tears like a torrent day and night. Do not rest nor allow your eye to cease from crying.' Since the Prophet has fulfilled many of the laments for the sufferings and has enumerated the evils which had happened, he turns to Jerusalem itself, and urges her to placate God by pouring down tears like a torrent on behalf of her sins.

Note the use of the verb 'hortatur'. Hugh too uses a related word at this point: 'Erectis per consolationem animis, exhortatio sequitur, in qua peccatores ad penitentiam inuitantur.'¹⁹⁰ He too draws attention to the prophet's change of tack mid-verse, adding the idea that its abruptness is intended by Jeremiah to wake up the audience.¹⁹¹

At 2:20, Paschasius marks another key point in the text by his discussion of the different functions of the Prophet's lament: at one point Jeremiah laments the sufferings of his people; at another he emphasizes the good or desirable things it has lost; at another he grieves because God has been offended. Paschasius finally says that the prophet never ceases to pour forth prayers to Him: '...nunc Deum offensum dolet nec tamen pro eis ad eum preces fundere cessat' ('...now he laments the fact that God has been offended, but does not cease pouring forth prayers to him on their account').¹⁹² It is perhaps this last detail which prompted Hugh to see the end of Lamentations 2 as being a *deprecatio*, a prayer for mercy.

Thus, we see Paschasius distinguishing three points in Lamentations 2 which also correspond to the beginnings of three of Hugh's divisions, transmitting to the latter the framework for a structural analysis of this chapter. Paschasius does not, however, mention any of the rhetorical categories later employed by Hugh. What, then, are his sources for these? The terms *conquestio* and *deprecatio* bear clear associations with legal oratory, deriving ultimately from Ciceronian

¹⁹⁰ 307C.

¹⁹¹ 307C.

¹⁹² PL 120, 1138B.

rhetorical handbooks, in particular, *De inventione* or *Ad Herennium*.¹⁹³ *Consolatio*, on the other hand, belongs more to the realm of philosophical and literary tradition, evoking writers such as Seneca, Jerome and of course Boethius.¹⁹⁴ It does, nonetheless, have a limited rhetorical usage,¹⁹⁵ occurring in Cicero's *De oratore* alongside classes of oratory such as *conquestio*, *cohortatio* and *obiurgatio*.¹⁹⁶ But whereas it is feasible to assume that Hugh might have had access to either *De inventione* or *Ad Herennium*, it is doubtful in the case of *De oratore*, which had a piecemeal and limited circulation in the twelfth century.¹⁹⁷

The headings *increpatio* and *preceptio*, however, are not recognizable rhetorical labels. The latter is used in rhetoric manuals, but to denote 'rule'.¹⁹⁸ Perhaps they are suggestive of the more technical *obiurgatio* and *exhortatio* respectively.¹⁹⁹

Let us consider both how Hugh defines these categories and how he applies them in practice. He uses a vivid medical simile, which is reminiscent of the long tradition of Christ as Physician.²⁰⁰ Preaching to sinful mankind he likens to treating a sick patient, with each of the five rhetorical categories matching a medical practice:

Medicus noster egrotum in manibus tenens, ecce quomodo artis sue peritiam probat. Primum stupida membra diu palpando ad sensum reuocat, et tactu leni uulnera dolentia attrectando ad ictum confirmat. Deinde secatur, deinde ungit, deinde ligat, deinde fouet et ad plenam sanitatem reparat. Sic alphabetum istud in

¹⁹³ For *conquestio*, see footnote 184 and also these further references: *De inventione* 1.98, 2.36, 2.51, 2.71 and 2.102; *Ad Herennium* 3.25 and 27. For *deprecatio*, see *De inventione* 1.15, 2.94, 2.104, 2.105, 2.111.

¹⁹⁴ See, for example, Seneca, *Ad Polybium de consolatione*, Jerome, *Epistula* LX and Boethius, *Consolatio Philosophiae*.

¹⁹⁵ See *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* IV (1909), cols 477-8.

¹⁹⁶ *De oratore*, 2:50.

¹⁹⁷ See L. D Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983), pp.102-5. But on p.106 it is pointed out that John of Salisbury draws on it in *Policraticus*, 7-8. Both *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium* are contained in 'numerous complete manuscripts from the tenth century onwards' (Ibid. p.99).

¹⁹⁸ For example, *De inventione*, *passim*.

¹⁹⁹ For *obiurgatio* as a synonym of *increpatio*, see *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (1964), 7.1.2, cols 1048-1049. The quotations in the article suggest that *increpatio* is largely confined to Christian Latin literature.

²⁰⁰ The Christ as Physician theme frequently occurs in patristic literature, especially in Augustine. David Knipp has kindly given me many references to patristic texts and to an article by Rudolph Arbesmann, 'The Concept of *Christus medicus* in St Augustine,' *Traditio*, 10 (1954), 1-28.

quinque partitiones distinguimus. Prima est conquestio. Secunda est increpatio. Tertia est consolatio. Quarta est preceptio. Quinta est deprecatio. Per conquestionem palpat, per increpationem secat, per consolationem ungit, per preceptionem ligat, per deprecationem fouet. Conquestio est a principio alphabeti usque ad eum locum ubi dicitur: *Cui comparabo te* etc. Ibi increpatio incipit et tenditur usque ad eum locum ubi dicitur: *Fecit Dominus que cogitavit* etc. Ibi consolatio incipit et tenditur usque ad eum locum ubi dicitur: *Deduc quasi torrentem lacrimas*; in qua preceptione peccatores informantur ad penitentiam, et tenditur usque ad eum locum ubi dicitur: *Vide, Domine*. Abinde usque ad finem deprecatio est, in qua Propheta Dominum pro peccatoribus exorat.²⁰¹

When our Physician takes hold of the sick man, see how he proves his experience in his art. First he restores to numbed limbs their sense of feeling by massaging them ^{for a long time} and with a gentle touch strengthens the painful wounds ^{for the knife} by handling them. Then he performs surgery, then he applies ointments, then he puts on a bandage, then he applies fomentations and thus restores the limbs to full health. So we divide this alphabet into five sections. The first is lament, the second reproach, the third consolation, the fourth instruction, the fifth is prayers for mercy. He massages by means of lament; he performs surgery by means of reproach; he applies ointment by means of consolation, he puts on a bandage by means of instruction; he applies fomentations by means of prayers for mercy. Lament extends from the beginning of the alphabet to that place where it says: *To whom shall I compare you?* etc. There, reproach begins and it extends to that place where it says: *The Lord put into practice what He planned* etc. There, consolation begins and it extends to that place where it says: *Pour down tears like a torrent*; in which instruction sinners are taught how to repent, and this extends to that place where it says: *See, Lord*. From here to the end extends deprecation, in which the prophet prays for sinners.

Here Hugh spells out very clearly the divisions of the text, and he fully draws out the parallel with medical operations. The only rhetorical terms he actually defines as such are the last two. *Preceptio* aims at teaching sinners how to repent. *Deprecatio* allows the Prophet to pray for them. There is, however, a confusing feature of this otherwise lucid passage. The term ‘*Medicus noster*’ at once brings to mind Christ, and yet here would apply more suitably to Jeremiah. At any rate, at the end of the prologue, reference is made to the prophet praying for sinners.

²⁰¹ 26 C-D.

Representatives of God, notably priests in the Church, are compared to doctors curing the sick. An example is Hugh's allegorical interpretation of the question *Quis medebitur tui?* in 2:13.²⁰² Moreover, although Christ as Physician curing the sickness of sin is a common image (especially since He treated actual illness in the Gospels), I can nowhere find the analogy between Christ as healer and Christ as preacher.

Within the actual commentary itself, Hugh signals these rhetorical sections:

- 2:16: 'Deinceps post increpationem, consolationem subiungit...'

('Then after reproach, he adds consolation...')

- 2: (mid-)18: 'Erectis per consolationem animis, exhortatio sequitur, in qua peccatores ad penitentiam inuitantur.'

('Since their emotions have been aroused by consolation, exhortation now follows, in which sinners are called to repent.')

- 2:20: 'Non desistit a proposito iste donec coepta ad finem perducatur. Hactenus enim cum peccatoribus egit, ut eos ad penitentiam inflecteret; nunc penitentiam causam suscipiens ad Deum sermonem conuertit, ut eum pro peccatoribus exoret.'

('He does not cease from his undertaking until he brings what he has begun to completion. For up to this point he has dealt with sinners, in order to turn them to repentance. Now taking up penitence as a cause he turns his words towards God, in order to pray to Him on behalf of sinners.')

Several points are worth noting. Hugh does not signpost the beginning of the section entitled *increpatio* in his prologue, except in saying that the prophet

²⁰² 292C.

now addresses his people directly. The moral interpretation of 2:13 does, however, begin with the words 'Increpatur anima peccatrix'. Hugh does not use the term *preceptio*, but replaces it with the far more recognizably rhetorical *exhortatio*. Most worthy of notice is the way Hugh links these sections, so that there is a sequence of thought. The result is that Lamentations 2 is given a unifying structure. One has a strong sense of progression and purpose. In the opening words of Lamentations 1, Hugh speaks of the Prophet's aim of inspiring his audience to repent of their sins. In the introduction to the second chapter he uses the expressive medical simile to reiterate the idea that Lamentations serves to cure the sinner by leading him to repentance via various stages. True to his word, Hugh puts this scheme into practice.

d. Concluding remarks

Hugh's literal interpretation of Lamentations is thus largely concerned with style and rhetorical effect. It serves a twofold purpose: to clarify the actual text and to bring out its emotional force. The analysis of Lamentations 2 indicates a concentration on rhetoric which is reminiscent of the *trivium*. Hugh as teacher is at work here.

Study of the literal interpretation brings to the fore two essential features of this work. Firstly, the commentary on Lamentations 2 is distinct from that on Lamentations 1:1-3. The break between the two comes at the section which opens with the words 'Medicus noster', in which the shape and purpose of Lamentations 2 is set forth. Indeed, the analysis of the second poem in five sections implies that Hugh's interpretation of Lamentations 2 is a work in its own right.²⁰³ A separate point to highlight is that there is a lack of continuity between these two parts, since the explanation of the opening verses of the second chapter departs from the threefold scheme which so clearly shapes that of the first. These two characteristics raise certain issues about this work, in particular as to whether it

²⁰³ The *PL* is mistaken in referring to this preface as 'Totius primi alphabeti epilodus' (264C).

was cohesive and whether it was a finished composition. The allegorical interpretation will shed further light on this issue.

4. Allegorical interpretation

i. Theory

In chapter three of *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris*, which deals with the threefold exposition of the Scriptures, Hugh at first offers a straightforward and clear definition of the allegorical sense and then introduces complexity by dividing it into two parts:

Secunda expositio est allegorica. Est autem allegoria, cum per id quod ex littera significatum proponitur, aliud aliquid siue in preterito siue in presenti siue in futuro factum significatur. Dicitur allegoria quasi alieniloquium, quia aliud dicitur et aliud significatur, que subdiuiditur in simplicem allegoriam et anagogen. Et est simplex allegoria, cum per uisibile factum aliud inuisibile factum significatur. Anagoge, id est sursum ductio, cum per uisibile inuisibile factum declaratur.²⁰⁴

The second [manner of] exposition is allegorical. There is allegory when what has been said literally implies another different event in the past or the present or the future. It is called ‘allegoria’, ‘other speech’, as if it were, because one thing is said and another is signified. It is divided into simple allegory and anagogy. Simple allegory occurs when an invisible thing is signified by a visible thing. Anagogy, that is ‘a leading upwards’, occurs when an invisible thing is made plain by a visible thing.²⁰⁵

What is important to note here is the breadth of Hugh’s definition of allegory. It seems to cover all instances where symbolism occurs, where one thing actually symbolizes something else (although Hugh in fact uses a verb of signification rather than representation). This symbolism does not just refer to one person, event or phenomenon prefiguring someone or something in the future, for example, the Old Testament foreshadowing the New. Rather, it can relate to the past and present as well as to the future. However, the illustration he gives in this

²⁰⁴ PL 175, col.12A-B.

²⁰⁵ Anagogy corresponds to the tropological sense. See above p.41.

chapter of *De scripturis* has an Old Testament figure, Job, prefiguring Christ descending into the dungheap of human misery.

Hugh goes on to specify that what is signified is invisible, which implies that it is something hidden by whatever is before one's eyes. It also suggests a hierarchy, since in Hugh's Neoplatonic scheme of things, one ascends to the invisible via the visible. The invisible is closer to God. The visible is the means by which one draws closer to Him. By stating that a visible thing can denote an invisible thing, Hugh may also be pointing to actual things signifying ideas. This would accord with his discussion of allegory in Book 6 of the *Didascalicon*, where it is equated with religious doctrine. Allegory is presented as a superstructure built on top of the foundation of history, with each course of bricks corresponding to a level of God's mysteries, of which there are eight layers.²⁰⁶ The first category concerns the 'sacrament of the Trinity', the second Creation, the third free will, grace and original sin, the fourth the 'sacraments under natural law' pertaining to the 'restoration of man', the fifth the sacraments under the written law, the sixth 'the sacrament of the Incarnation of the Word', the seventh the 'sacraments of the New Testament, and the eighth the sacrament of the Resurrection. Such a structure prefigures the framework of Hugh's later theological *summa*, his *De sacramentis*, a work which he himself describes as being wholly concerned with allegory,²⁰⁷ under which heading fall the mysteries or sacraments. Hugh defines the sacraments as follows: '...sacramentum est corporale vel materiale elementum foris sensibilter propositum ex similitudine repraesentans, et ex institutione significans, et ex sanctificatione continens aliquam invisibilem et spiritualem gratiam.'²⁰⁸ ('A sacrament is a corporeal or material element set before the senses without, representing by similitude and signifying by institution and containing by sanctification some invisible and spiritual grace.')

²⁰⁶ *Didascalicon* 6.4 (PL 176, col. 803A-B).

²⁰⁷ *De sacramentis*, prologue (PL 176, 183-4).

²⁰⁸ *De sacramentis* 1.9.2 (PL 176, col. 317D).

ii. Application in *Super Lamentationes*

At first sight, it is hard to see how Hugh's specific discussion of allegory in the *Didascalicon* and his application of it in *De sacramentis* are relevant to his allegorical exposition of Lamentations. Verse-by-verse commentary does not lend itself to a systematic treatment of Christian mysteries. Key elements of these mysteries, such as Christocentric teachings concerning restoration and salvation, are scarcely mentioned in this commentary. We will have to probe deeper to find a connection between Hugh's practice of allegory in expounding Lamentations and his idea^S on allegory in these two major works.

On the face of it, one might take Hugh's broad definition of allegory in *De scripturis* as being particularly appropriate to *Super Lamentationes*. Thus, one thing and one event, Jerusalem and its destruction in 586 BC, signify something different, most notably the Church undermined by sinfulness, wicked clergy and heresy. In this instance, something in the past symbolizes something else in the present. But we also find the symbolism extending into the past and the future. Thus, the first five verses of Lamentations 2, which Hugh interpreted literally as presenting God casting down and laying waste first the physical region and then the city itself, allegorically signify the Fall, God's casting down of the first man (and its subsequent effect on humankind). The final verse of Lamentations 2 has an allegorical sense which points forward to Judgement Day at the end of time.

Hugh's allegorical exposition of Lamentations 2 thus spans the whole of time. Indeed, Jeremiah is seen as lamenting the sinfulness that has marked human history. In his allegorical interpretation of Lamentations 2:10, Hugh expresses this very idea:

Prophete mens uniuerſa mala presentis uite considerans, compunctionis oculum ab exordio ducens, ab ipſo primi hominis lapſu, uſque ad excecationem Iudaici populi, ac deinde descendens per mala presentis Eccleſie, uſque ad finem temporis planctum extendit.

The mind of the prophet reflects upon all the evils of this present life, guiding the eye of compunction from the very beginning, from the fall of the first man, right up to the blinding

of the Jewish people, and then through the evils of our present Church. He extends his lament on to the end of time.

Here Hugh has marked what he regards as keypoints in the wretched history of humankind: the Fall, the blinding of the Jewish people, the sins of Hugh's contemporary Church, and the end of time, which conjures up the idea of Judgement Day. The allegorical exposition of Lamentations 2 is structured so as to deal with each of these four happenings in sequence and, certainly as regards the first three, in some considerable detail. The scheme is as follows:

Lamentations 2

Verses:

1-4/5:	Original sin and its consequences
5-9:	God's rejection of the Jewish people
10-21:	the evils afflicting Hugh's contemporary Church
22:	Judgment Day

This clear plan is further evidence that Hugh's exposition of Lamentations 2 was a separate undertaking from that of Lamentations 1:1-3. Just as the latter lies outside the division of Lamentations 2 into rhetorical sections, as discussed above, so it is divorced from this sequential treatment of historical themes. The allegories of Lamentations 1 exclusively concern Hugh's contemporary Church, as we shall see.

The arrangement of his commentary on the first nine verses of Lamentations 2 entails a developed and, to a certain extent, more sequential discussion of the first two of the above-mentioned themes, namely, original sin and God's rejection of the Jewish people. The first five verses are understood as referring to the fall of the First Man and its consequences for the human soul thereafter. Allegorical and tropological senses are here merged into one. After verse five has been interpreted with reference to the human soul, there is a notable change of tack, as Hugh picks up a fresh theme with the following words: '*Ad populum etiam Iudaicum hoc specialiter referri potest.*' ('This verse [2:5] can also

be referred specifically to the Jewish people.’) In his exposition of verses 5-9, Hugh treats the topic of God’s rejection of the Jewish people in favour of a new ‘Chosen People’, Christians. For verses 2:6-7, he intersperses this allegorical treatment of Jerusalem’s destruction with the tropological sense, thus resuming some semblance of the usual structure. Indeed, as we have already noted, he marks the beginning of the moral interpretation of 2:6 with the words: ‘Si autem ea que supradicta sunt ad moralem sensum conuertimus...’ (‘But if we apply the moral sense to what has been said above...’). This is one of the few references to the senses in the commentary on Lamentations 2, possibly placed here because Hugh had consciously abandoned the exegetical scheme in order to devote himself to an extended discussion of original sin and its consequences, a subject which, since it bears upon both allegory and tropology, would have been hampered by an artificial separation of these two senses.

At Lamentations 2:8, Hugh resumes the threefold structure again, even though he had given a literal exposition of 2:8-9 earlier, in the section devoted to the primary sense of verses 1-9. His allegorical reading of this verse is mainly concerned with the theme of God’s punishment of the Jewish people, but includes references to prelates in the Church. The following verse, 2:10 is at first understood allegorically as contrasting Christians and Jews, then as relating to the former in particular. It is as though these two verses mark a transitional phase between the theme of the fall of the Jewish people just treated and the new theme to dominate from now on, namely the Church and its ills. Indeed, it is the allegorical exposition of 2:10 that opens with the words cited above about the Prophet lamenting evils which extend from the fall of the First Man to the present Church and then on to the end of time.

From here on, Hugh maintains the threefold scheme.²⁰⁹ There remains, nonetheless, a unity of theme in the allegorical sections, with no reference back to the earlier subjects of the original sin and the rejection of the Jewish people. Thus, in the mystical treatment of Lamentations 2, Hugh had a clear sense of structure, just as he did in the literal handling of this chapter, with his division of it into five rhetorical sections. The ^{allegorical} interpretation has a clear progression, following the

²⁰⁹ For 2:11, see above p41

sequence of religious history. There is a shift too from the general to the specific and then back to the general, from humanity afflicted by the Fall to the particular evils of the Jewish people and then the sufferings of the Church, back to the experience of humanity at the end of time (though in the last instance, Hugh may well be referring to the experience of Christians in particular, although language is non-specific).

Having identified the overall scheme of the allegorical exposition, let us look more closely at how Hugh handles these themes individually, as this sheds light upon the use of a biblical text as a medium for the development of particular preoccupations.

iii. Original Sin.

The opening words of his allegorical interpretation of Lamentations 2:1 highlight the extent of the lament here. The destruction of Jerusalem and punishment of its inhabitants represents God's expulsion of the first man. Hugh plunges into the theme quite abruptly:

Quomodo obtexit etc. Sub unius gentis specie totius humani generis casum deplorat. Primus homo tribus modis percussus est, ignorantia, concupiscentia, mortalitate. Mortalitas autem mors ipsa cum uniuersis defectibus et penis ipsam mortem precurrentibus intelligitur.²¹⁰

How God covered etc. In the fall of a single people he laments that of ^{the whole human} race. The first man was struck in three ways: by ignorance, ^{concupiscentia} and mortality. Mortality is understood as actual death along with all the defects and punishments which precede it.

Here Hugh does something quite untypical for him. He begins expounding a verse without any direct reference to the words of the verse itself. He tends to do this at key junctures in his commentary, as though prefacing a new section. His summing up here of original sin (or rather its consequences) serves as an introduction to a

²¹⁰ 270A.

lengthy discussion of this theme which is thereafter tied to the actual verses being explained. It is best to illustrate how Hugh interweaves lemma and thought by scrutinizing his procedure when interpreting the first verse of Lamentations 2. (It is important to demonstrate this, as later on my discussion may tend to divorce the ideas being developed from the biblical verse being interpreted.)

After the concise introduction to the topic of the Fall of Man, Hugh cites the first line of 2:1 in full and, as is his wont, connects each element of it to his theme: 'Quomodo obtexit caligine in furore suo Dominus filiam Sion' ('How in His fury He covered in darkness the daughter of Sion'). This represents the darkness of ignorance into which God cast the First Man after his sin. Hugh draws attention to the choice of diction: 'obtexit' suggests a temporary concealment: the light of human reason is not utterly removed, but is temporarily obscured. Zion signifies a figurative look-out or circumspection, with which, Hugh maintains, man should have heeded God's warning to him about not eating from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Man is referred to as the daughter of Zion, because his soul is still inexperienced and lacking in the necessary circumspection. Thus, through the sin caused by man's failure to be circumspect, he was temporarily cast into the darkness of ignorance.

The following line further illustrates this method of tying the text of Lamentations closely to the ideas that Hugh is developing on the Fall of Man: 'Proiecit de celo in terram inclutam Israel.' Hugh glosses Israel as 'man seeing God'. Before sin, Adam was Israel because he could see God. The earth referred to here symbolizes Adam's body, created mortal from earth but immortalized by transference to heaven. Man's sin caused God to make him revert to his primitive mortality. He is cast down from immortality to mortality. Hugh brings in a sense of the correct ordering of ideas here:

Recte autem propheta plangendo casum hominis, primum caliginem mentis, ac deinde corruptionem carnis commemorat; quia merito precedere debuit in pena, que precessit in culpa: ut sicut caro, nisi prius corrupta mente in delectationem illicitam non uenisset, ita quoque, nisi prius per ignorantiam cecata mente caro in corruptionem non descenderet.²¹¹

²¹¹ 270D.

Rightly in lamenting the fall of man, the prophet first mentions the darkness which fell upon his spirit / mind, and then the corruption of his flesh. For what has preceded in guilt should precede in punishment. Just as the flesh would not have fallen into illicit delight, if the mind had not first been corrupted, so also the flesh would not have descended into corruption had the mind not been blinded by ignorance.

Hugh ascribes to Jeremiah a logical sequence of thought in his lament. The individual elements of his poetry - the particular diction or phraseology - as well as their arrangement are made to relate to religious doctrine. He pinpoints the symbolism of particular words or phrases - 'obtextit', 'caligine', 'filiam Sion', 'proiecit de celo', 'in terram', 'Israel' - and weaves them together into a unified idea: sin deprived man of knowledge of God and resulted in his mortality.

An analysis of the allegorical interpretation of these two lines demonstrates how fruitful interpretation of the Bible could be. Doctrine becomes enhanced by Scriptural support, its thought made vivid by the powerful images in the text. In his literal interpretation, Hugh had brought out the emotional force of the words. This literal reading, in turn, now accentuates the significance of the allegorical sense. The focus on the calamitousness of the actual fall of Jerusalem underlines the awfulness of the Fall of humanity. Lamentations, then, offers Hugh ample opportunity to present and enforce doctrine fundamental to Christian belief.

The question arises of Hugh's choice of subject-matter. In other words, why does he choose to focus on original sin? Rupert of Deutz devoted his exposition of Lamentations 1 to the theme of the captivity of the human race caused by the first parents.²¹² But he tended to make general references to the Fall, without elaborating at any great length. This is also the case for the other commentaries on Lamentations prior to or contemporaneous with Hugh's. Unlike these commentators, Hugh's treatment of the theme develops a theological doctrine about original sin, constructed out of the specific details.

Hugh's choice of topic here and elaboration of it might be explained in terms of his general preoccupations. As a leading theologian of his age, it is hardly

²¹² See above p.33.

surprising that original sin concerned him. We have seen how, in the *Didascalicon*, it is the third category (*ordo*) of mysteries falling within the orbit of allegory.²¹³ Indeed, a section of *De sacramentis*, entitled ‘De lapsu’, is devoted to it.²¹⁴ There, the transgression of the first man is described as having a double impact on humanity: ‘Hoc autem vitium originis humanae duplici corruptione naturam inficit, ignorantia scilicet mentem, et concupiscentia carnem.’²¹⁵ (‘But this vice of human origin infects nature with a twofold corruption, namely the mind with ignorance, and the flesh with concupiscence.’) He further elucidates these punishments as follows:

In illo [Adam]...spiritus per superbiam contra Creatorem tumens obedientiam non tenuit; et idcirco creator ad ulciscendam injuriam suam spiritum quidem ignorantia, carnem vero concupiscentia damnavit, ut in se bonum agendum non videat; in carne autem sua malum agere concupiscat. Haec duo vitia ad puniendam superbiam hominis juste in ipso confirmantur. Ignorantia quidem, dum ab animo subtrahitur lumen veritatis; concupiscentia vero, dum caro percutitur poena mortalitatis...Si ergo quaeritur quid sit originale peccatum, in nobis intelligitur corruptio sive vitium quod nascendo trahimus per ignorantiam in mente, per concupiscentiam in carne.²¹⁶

In him [Adam]...the spirit swelling with pride against the Creator did not keep obedience, and, therefore, the Creator, to avenge His injury, punished the spirit with ignorance indeed but the flesh with concupiscence, so that the spirit does not see in itself the good to be done but in its flesh desires to do evil. These two vices to punish man’s pride are justly confirmed in him, ignorance, indeed, because the light of truth is taken from the mind, but concupiscence because the flesh is afflicted with the punishment of mortality...If, therefore, it is asked what is original sin in us, it is understood to be the corruption or vice which we take by birth through ignorance in the mind, through concupiscence in the flesh.

There is a certain overlap between Hugh’s treatment of the subject in *Super Lamentationes* and this Augustinian account in his theological treatise: Adam’s

²¹³ See above p.62.

²¹⁴ *De sacramentis*, 1.7 (PL 176, cols 287B-306B).

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.7.26 (PL 176, col. 298B).

²¹⁶ *De sacramentis*, 1.7.227-8 (PL 176, cols 298C-299A).

swelling pride;²¹⁷ God's exacting punishment because Man fails to fulfil the precept of obedience;²¹⁸ the subsequent loss of the 'light of truth' at the onset of ignorance;²¹⁹ the contracting of lust by being born.²²⁰ However, there is a notable difference, for in *De sacramentis* the after-effects of the first sin are described as two, ignorance and lust, with mortality connected with the second (understandably, since it pertains to the body). In *Super Lamentationes*, there is a threefold formulation: ignorance, lust and mortality.²²¹ The last of these is glossed as actual death coupled with the defects and afflictions which occur during life. The fact that Hugh needs to explain it here indicates that he is introducing a new element into an old formula. It goes without saying that mortality is a central element of traditional accounts of original sin. But by moving from the twofold to a threefold formulation, Hugh is departing from traditional treatments of this theme.

Furthermore, this threefold scheme broadly structures Hugh's discussion of original sin in *Super Lamentationes*. Thus, the interpretation of 2:1 centres on ignorance;²²² that of 2:2-3, largely upon the effects of sin upon the human soul;²²³ that of 2:4 (at least for the the first half of the exposition) upon mortality in the sense of God's punishment of sinners both in this life and that to come.²²⁴ The structure is not rigid (there is some overlap in themes), but its imprint is undeniable. Hugh's introduction to his allegorical exposition of Lamentations 2, therefore, not only identifies the theme to come, but provides an outline for its treatment. Here again is an example of the way Hugh orders his material. The fact that this is a line-by-line commentary does not constrain him from developing sequential thought. Nonetheless, we must bear in mind that the ideas set forth are inextricably linked by Hugh with the lemmata expounded, in such a way that it is only through standing back from the exposition and unravelling the patchwork of interpreted verses that a pattern emerges.

²¹⁷ 271D.

²¹⁸ 271A.

²¹⁹ 270A.

²²⁰ 272C.

²²¹ See above p.66.

²²² 270A-D.

²²³ 271C-272D.

²²⁴ 272D-273B.

This drawing together of biblical text and developed doctrine raises the question of why Lamentations prompted such a lengthy treatment of original sin, especially since it results in the breakdown not only of the threefold exposition, but also of the distinction between senses. For this section hovers between the sphere of allegory and that of tropology, causing confusion among subsequent readers.²²⁵ Exploring this issue will shed light upon Hugh's whole direction in this work. In addressing this question, it is best to identify first what aspects of original sin interested Hugh here, then to relate this to the broader context of his commentary as a whole (on Lamentations 2).

The darkness that God casts over Jerusalem is interpreted as the darkness of ignorance into which the First Man fell after sin. He forfeited his sight of God. This ignorance causes his mind to be blinded - 'cecata mente'.²²⁶ The contemplation of God is certainly a central preoccupation of Hugh, underlying many of his writings.²²⁷ The image of vision and sight are pervasive. In his other major biblical commentary, *In Ecclesiasten*, it recurs as a theme.²²⁸ With reference to the Fall in particular, he employs elsewhere the vivid image of the three eyes of man, the eye of contemplation, the eye of reason and the eye of flesh. Because of sin, the first is extinguished, the second partly obscured, with only the third left intact.²²⁹ Hugh possibly alludes to this idea in *Super Lamentationes* where he speaks of God depriving man of his former sight of invisible treasures and allowing that of visible creation to be distorted by the lust of the flesh.²³⁰ In fact, in his discussion of original sin, Hugh evokes the image of humanity, including all Christians, as afflicted by partial blindness. It is an image to bear in mind, for the second theme of the allegorical interpretation of Lamentations 2 is the *excecatio Iudeorum*, 'the blinding of the Jews'. Again, he speaks of God as depriving the

²²⁵ See below p.271.

²²⁶ 270D.

²²⁷ See above pp.21-2..

²²⁸ See Pollitt, 'Hugh as Biblical Exegete', ch. 5, where, for this particular commentary, he cites the following references: *In Ecclesiasten* 2 (PL 175, col. 143B), 10 (173A-177C), 12 (196B), 13 (205C).

²²⁹ See, for example, *De sacramentis*, 1.10.2 (PL 176, cols 329D-330A); *In Hierarchiam celestem* (PL 175, col. 976A): here in fact the eye of contemplation is actually described as 'blind' ('caecus'); see Baron, 'Hugues', p.923, and *Science et sagesse chez Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Paris, 1957), pp.194-5.

²³⁰ 271B-C.

Jews of their former knowledge of Him.²³¹ The analogy between the partial blindness of the First Man (and subsequent humanity) and the full blindness of the Jews will prove significant. For the time being, it should be noted that this is a universal affliction, from which no-one is spared.

It must be said that although Hugh is here elucidating the specific case of the First Man, he constantly relates this to the whole of humankind. The treatment often reads as though it has general application to Hugh's contemporaries. The references to Adam dotted throughout take it back to this specific event. Moreover, the discussion seems to border on the tropological sense, with a vocabulary of this sphere: 'anima', 'castitas', 'uirtutes', 'conscientia', 'corruptio', 'caro', 'motus', 'appetitus', 'desideria', 'bona opera', 'cogitationes' and so forth. Thus, allegory and tropology merge. But what seems to be a unifying factor is the tendency towards systematization. Just as the Fall is explained, so are the machinations of the soul under the influence of sin. Hugh provides the whole background for the individual's internal spiritual struggle. It is as though he is presenting a *ratio*, an 'account' or 'science' of the make-up of the soul and its degeneration.²³²

The recurrent references back to the First Man keeps this tropological treatment firmly anchored to the allegorical basis of original sin.²³³ Thus, the razing of Jerusalem and humiliation of its people both look backwards in their symbolization of a calamity at the beginning of history, and look forward to our personal experience as sinners. Interestingly, Hugh presents the problem, but does not provide the solution, as though concentrating on the sickness but not the cure. He does not refer to our restoration through the Incarnation. Nor does he touch upon the ascent towards contemplation and the good. For in a sense, the nature of Lamentations is determining his approach. It is, after all, a dirge. Just as Hugh emphasized the awfulness of what Jeremiah was lamenting, so he focuses upon the calamitousness of the Fall and the consequences of sin for each individual.

²³¹ See below, pp.78-9.

²³² For instance, 271C-D; 272A-D.

²³³ For 2:1-2 (270A-271C), Adam and his transgression are to the fore. Thereafter, he is reintroduced at 271D ('Postquam...invenit'), 272B-C ('Primum hominem...sentiret.'), 273A ('Primo namque homini...superadicit'), thereby figuring in the exposition of the four opening verses, but not 2:5 onwards.

This explains his direct analogy between God's casting down of Jerusalem and that of man: '*Precipitavit Dominus nec pepercit. Precipitatio ad magnam et ad subitam ruinam pertinet. Videte quam magna ruina. De paradiso in hunc mundum, de hoc mundo in infernum homo corrui. De immortalitate in mortem, de morte in dampnationem.*' ('*God cast down and He did not spare. Casting down applies to a great and sudden fall. See just how great a fall. From paradise into this world, from this world into Hell man has fallen. From immortality to death, from death to damnation.*')²³⁴

Hugh states at the outset of his commentary on Lamentations 1 a very clear idea of Jeremiah's intention: to move his audience to repent (1:1).²³⁵ The medical metaphor in the prologue to Lamentations 2 restates this aim in more expressive terms. It is no surprise, therefore, that the closing words of this section of the allegorical exposition of 2:1-5 refer specifically to this purpose: '*donec...ad penitentiam redeat.*'²³⁶

iv. *Excecatio Iudeorum.*

Immediately after Hugh's reference to repentance, there is an abrupt change of theme. Hugh then turns to the way the destruction of 586 BC symbolizes God's later rejection of the Jewish people, which he calls a second expulsion after that of Adam. The parallel serves as a smooth transition from one theme to another, a device which Hugh will employ again. The subject dominates his allegorical treatment of 2:5-9 and opens that of 2:10.

Hugh is no innovator in introducing anti-Jewish thought into his commentary. Hrabanus, the first fully-fledged expositor of Lamentations, launched hard-hitting, direct attacks against this people, in particular claiming that the destruction of Jerusalem represented God's punishment of the Jews for causing Christ's death.²³⁷ Paschasius adopted the *topos* from his predecessor. But neither of these Carolingian figures developed the subject at any great length.

²³⁴ 271A.

²³⁵ 255D.

²³⁶ 274D. These words are in fact borrowed from Paschasius (PL 120, col. 1116A).

²³⁷ See above p.28.

However, in the twelfth century, Rupert of Deutz devoted his exposition of Lamentations 4 to the captivity of the Jews: 'that worst captivity, through which [Jeremiah] foresaw that the Jews, as now happens, would fall on swords and would be led as captives throughout all nations.'²³⁸ Moreover, outside of Lamentations exegesis, there is a marked resurgence of anti-Jewish polemic.²³⁹ Rupert of Deutz himself had written a dialogue between a Christian and Jew, a favoured medium for attacks on Jews and their religion.²⁴⁰ The iconography of this period bears witness to the growing presence of the theme in manuscript illustrations and church decorations, including crucifix scenes in which Church and Synagogue are portrayed as women, the former on the right of the cross in triumph, the latter on the left in defeat, often with a veil or blindfold covering her eyes.²⁴¹

Both the Jewish theme in general and the image of their blindness in particular were very much part of the whole context within which Hugh was composing *Super Lamentationes*. Generally, scholars have focused on the genre of the dialogue between Christian and Jew in exploring the issue of anti-Judaism in the twelfth century. They have tended to ignore the value of biblical exegesis to the understanding of this theme, overlooking the role of exegesis as a medium for thought and ideology. Hugh's *Super Lamentationes*, however, presents an example of how an exegetical work could be used to present teachings on the Jews. Hugh's doctrine becomes linked with the biblical text and is afforded, therefore, spiritual sanction.

²³⁸ *De Trinitate*, 29.12.

²³⁹ Examples from the first half of the twelfth century are the following: Guibert of Nogent, *Tractatus de incarnatione contra Iudaeos* (PL 156, cols 489-528); Hildebert of Lavardin, *Sermo CI contra Iudaeos de incarnatione* (PL 171, cols 811-814). See H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos Texte (11-13 Jh), mit einer Ikonographie des Judenthemas bis zum IV Laterankonzil* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1988).

²⁴⁰ *Anulus seu dialogus inter Christianum et Iudaeum*, ed. by M. L. Arduini (Rome, 1979).

²⁴¹ B. Blumenkranz, *Le juif médiéval au miroir de l'art chrétien* (Paris, 1966), pp.106-107: 'De nombreux témoignages du haut moyen âge montrent comment le Judaïsme, s'il fut alors considéré comme adversaire, le fut pourtant à titre d'adversaire presque égal, et en tout cas conscient de soi, fier et combattif, indompté... Dans l'histoire de ce thème, on reconnaît également la coupure profonde apportée par l'an 1096.' See also P. Hildenfinger, 'La figure de la Synagogue dans l'art du moyen âge', *Revue des études juives*, 47 (1903), pp.187-196; H. Schreckenberg, *Die Juden in der Kunst Europas: Ein historischer Bildatlas* (Göttingen-Freiburg in Breisgau, 1996), pp.31-53.

Hugh speaks of the *excecatio Iudeorum* as though it were a familiar concept. Christian writers from the first centuries onwards found the seeds of it in the New Testament, in particular in the Pauline Epistles. St Paul presented the Jewish denial of the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament as a failure to understand the true meaning of their own Scriptures:

Sed obtusi sunt sensus eorum. Usque in hodiernum enim diem id ipsum velamen in lectione veteris testamenti manet; non revelatum quoniam in Christo evacuatur. Sed usque in hodiernum diem cum legitur Moses, velamen est positum super cor eorum. Cum autem conversus fuerit ad Deum, aufertur velamen.²⁴²

But their perception was blunted. For to this very day, when they read the Old Testament, that same veil remains unlifted, because only through Christ is it taken away. To this very day, when Moses is read, a veil lies over their minds. But when a man turns to the Lord, the veil is removed.

A veil can be removed and thus implies a temporary lack of comprehension. More drastic, however, is the image of Jewish blindness we find Paul employing elsewhere when speaking of those Jews who had failed to convert:

Quod quaerebat Israhel, hoc non est consecutus. Electio autem consecuta est. Ceteri vero excaecati sunt, sicut scriptum est: 'Dedit illis Deus spiritum conpunctionis, oculos ut non videant et aures ut non audiant usque in hodiernum diem.'²⁴³

Israel failed to obtain what it sought. The elect obtained it, but the rest were blinded, as has been written: *God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that should not see and ears that should not hear, down to this very day.*²⁴⁴

²⁴² 2 Corinthians 3:14-15.

²⁴³ Romans, 11:7-8.

²⁴⁴ Paul speaks in general of any who fail to see the truth of the Gospels as being blind: 'Quod si etiam opertum est evangelium nostrum, in his qui pereunt est opertum, in quibus Deus huius saeculi excecavit mentes infidelium, ut non fulgeat illuminatio evangelii glorie Christi, qui est imago Dei' (2 Corinthians 4, 3-4). ('But if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled to those who are perishing. The God of this age has blinded the minds of unbelievers, so that they cannot see the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God.')

This Apostle perhaps inherited such a striking image from the Gospels. John the Evangelist explained the Jews' disbelief in the miraculous signs Jesus had laid before them as being due to God's having blinded them: 'Excecavit oculos eorum et induravit eorum cor, ut non videant oculis et intelligant corde...' ('He has blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, so that they cannot see with their eyes and understand with their hearts...'). Indeed, in his attack on the Scribes and the Pharisees, Jesus himself hurled the reproach of blindness, addressing them repeatedly as 'blind leaders'.²⁴⁵

The concept of Jewish blindness is strikingly used by Augustine. At one point, it becomes a crucial element in his argument for the continued existence of Judaism despite the Incarnation. He argued that the Jews were dispersed all over the world in order to serve as living witnesses to the Old Testament prophecies, they themselves being blind to the true meaning of these prophecies. The fact that Jews did not embrace Christianity meant that there was independent evidence that these Scriptures had existed before Christianity and that the Christians had not fabricated the texts which contained the predictions of Christ's coming. Ever-present Judaism thus served Christianity. Augustine, nevertheless, also claimed that many Jews did come to recognize the true meaning of their Scriptures and turned to Christ. The failure of the rest of them to convert he summed up as follows:

Ceteri vero excecati sunt, de quibus predictum est:...*Obscurentur oculi eorum, ne videant*.... Proinde cum scripturis nostris non credunt, complentur in eis sue, quas ceci legunt.²⁴⁶

But the rest of them were blinded; and of them it was predicted:...*Let their eyes be darkened, so that they may not see*. It follows that when the Jews do not believe in our Scriptures, their own Scriptures are fulfilled in them, while they read them with blind eyes.

²⁴⁵ 'Duces caeci...stulti et caeci...caeci...Duces caeci...Pharisaei caeci' (Matthew 23, 15-26). (Blind leaders...foolish blind men...Blind leaders...Blind Pharisees).

²⁴⁶ *De civitate Dei*, 18.46.

As in the examples from the New Testament, the blindness image used by Augustine is a metaphor for the inability or refusal of Jews to discern the Christian truth embedded in the Bible and accept Christ. In *Super Lamentationes*, Hugh uses the concept of the *excecatio Iudeorum* to signify a lot more than Jews' failure to comprehend the Christian interpretation of their Scriptures. Let us consider the various ramifications of his formulation.

Lamentations 2:5-9 contain a lament on God's intentional, hostile and relentless destruction of Jerusalem (through the agency of the Chaldeans), His rejection of the symbols of His worship, and the abject state of the vanquished inhabitants. In his literal interpretation, Hugh draws out how the words and images convey the magnitude of the actual destruction of 586 BC, and sees another historical reality, namely the Roman destruction of 70 AD, as an extension or even fulfilment of this earlier one. Allegorically, he understands the two destructions as prefiguring God's total rejection of the Jews and their faith subsequent to their denial of Christ. The key element in this process of rejection is the image of the blinding of the Jews, the *excecatio Iudeorum*. For Hugh, this blinding of the Jews is figurative, but extends beyond an image into a tangible, real event which marks a keypoint in history. In 2:10 we have seen how he imposes a framework upon the lament which encompasses the religious history of humankind, extending from its beginnings, as defined by the fall of man through original sin, to its termination by Judgement Day at the end of time. The blinding of the Jews and the evils of Hugh's contemporary church are placed between these two poles in chronological order, as though these are crucial moments in man's sinful history.²⁴⁷ Hugh may even be suggesting that the blinding of the Jews and the ills of the Church of his time are akin to original sin in gravity. However, he draws a closer analogy between the Fall and this blinding of the Jews, by stating, in the passage which opens the whole section devoted to the subject of the Jews, that their blinding marks God's second rejection of humankind:

Considerans namque Propheta qualiter Deus post eiectionem
primi hominis misereri uolens humano generi, solum hunc
populum elegit, ut in eo nostre salutis exordia prepararet;

²⁴⁷ 283B. See above pp.63-4.

quomodo illum date legis mandatis coluit et sua ubique protectione sublimauit, et post hec omnia peccantem et preuaricantem abiecit, et ita prime abiectiōi secundam adnumerans plangit dicens: *Factus est Dominus uelut inimicus. Precipitauit menia eius. Dissipauit munitiones eius.*²⁴⁸

For the prophet reflects upon how God desired to take pity on the human race after the expulsion of the First Man. Therefore, he chose this people alone with a view to sowing in it the seeds of our salvation. Jeremiah considers how God tended to this people by planting in it the commands of the appointed Law. He raised this people high by protecting it everywhere. After all these efforts, God cast off this people for their sins and transgressions. Therefore, seeing a second rejection added to the first, Jeremiah utters in lamentation: 'The Lord became like an enemy. He cast down its walls. He destroyed its fortifications.'

God's rejection of the Jewish people has all the enormity of His expulsion of Man from Paradise. The word which I have translated as 'rejection' - *abiectio* - literally means 'casting out', evoking the image of God expelling the Jews from their special position. As with Adam, it is their sinfulness that has caused their protector to hurl them down from the heights.

Hugh presents another parallel between Adam and the Jewish people. We have already discussed how Hugh speaks of the First Man as having lost sight of God and as having been condemned to the blindness of ignorance because of his transgression. The Jews, like Adam, are deprived of knowledge of God. God denies them the privileged relationship they had previously enjoyed with Him. In fact, He ceases to communicate with them altogether:

Quando enim a populo Iudeorum prophetiam et doctrinam et miraculorum signa abstulit, quasi menia eius praecipitauit. Quando uero per infidelitatem eos excecari permisit, et a spe promissionis et hereditatis sue alienos fecit, quasi munitiones eius dissipauit. (274C). ...Cum uero quosdam ex illis ad cognitionem secretorum suorum illuminans, etiam familiari alloquio suo dignos habuit, quasi tabernaculum ad inhabitandum extruxit. Sed quia postmodum in carne ueniens, populum illum.

²⁴⁸ 274C.

exigentibus peccatis suis, et cognitione ueritatis priuauit, et deinde per Romanos in omnes mundi nationes dispersit.²⁴⁹

For when God deprived the Jewish people of prophecy, teaching and miraculous signs, it was as if He cast down their walls. But when He let the Jews be blinded through their lack of faith, He dispossessed them of their hope for the fulfilment of prophecy and for their inheritance, which was like destroying their fortifications. ...But when God enlightened a few of these Jews, so that they would have knowledge of His mysteries, even considering them worthy of conversing with Him face to face, it was as if He constructed a tabernacle in which He would dwell. But once God came in the flesh, He was driven by the sins of this people to deprive them of the knowledge of the truth and to have them scattered by the Romans throughout all the nations of the world.

Contact is thus cut off. The Jews are dispossessed of their inheritance. Note the language of light and subsequent blindness: 'illuminans' and 'excecari'. The Jews once had sight of God, but then lost it (or rather God allowed them to lose it). Like Adam, they had experienced God firsthand. Like Adam, they were expelled from His sight. This, for Hugh, explains the Diaspora of the first century AD (which, in his literal interpretation of Lamentations, he sees as prefigured by the captivity of the Old Testament, following his Carolingian predecessors).

Hugh discusses the causes of this blinding and expulsion. He refers to the Jews' perceived infidelity and perfidy. Although the Prophets had announced his coming, the Scribes and the Pharisees refused to believe that Christ was the Divine Incarnation:

*Defixe sunt in terra porte eius. ...Scribe et Pharisei, doctores populi,... in terra defixi sunt, quia solam in Christo carnem attendentes in laqueum perfidie inciderunt.*²⁵⁰

[Jerusalem's] gates were fixed on the earth. ...The Scribes and the Pharisees are fixed on the earth, because they only pay attention to the carnal aspect of Christ, thereby falling into the noose of perfidy.

²⁴⁹ 275A.

²⁵⁰ 281C.

These Scribes and Pharisees even went to the lengths of persecuting and killing Christ, and they did so motivated by envy:

...nisi Scribas et Phariseos, doctores populi, in necem Saluatoris compulisset inuidia, populum ipsum tam crudeliter non dissipasset captiuitatis uindicta.²⁵¹

...if the Scribes and the Pharisees, teachers of the Jewish people had not been driven by envy to slaughter the Saviour, then the punishment of captivity would not have so cruelly dispersed that people.

In fact, they conspired in secret to slay Christ in order to protect their own interests, namely to avoid losing their land.²⁵² This they did lose by being dispersed by the Romans. According to Hugh, they brought this punishment upon themselves through their blindness; through their failure to recognize Christ as the Incarnation and through their guilt in plotting and causing his death.

Such an account places the responsibility for their own blinding firmly with the Jews. However, Hugh states that the rejection of the Jews was part of God's plan. God was denying Jews their exclusivity as the Chosen People and passing their religion on to Christians:

Cogitauit Dominus etc. Per cogitationem quippe Dei occulta dispensatio incarnationis eius intelligi potest. Et quia in carne ueniens occulto quodam consilio Iudeos reppulit, ut gentes ad fidem colligeret, quasi prius murum filie Syon dissipauit, id est protectionem suam a populo Iudeorum abstulit, ac sic deinde funiculum hereditatis suae super populum gentium dilatauit. Quasi enim contractus erat funiculus quando de populo Iudeorum tantum dicebatur: 'Iacob funiculus hereditatis eius.' Sed tunc funiculus tenditur, quando, ut dictum est, sors hereditatis super omnes gentes dilatatur. Quia uero illuminationem gentium precessit excecatio Iudeorum, recte subinfertur cum dicitur: 'Et non auertit manum suam a perditione.' Quasi enim funiculum tendens manum a perditione auerteret, si gentes colligens Iudeos non reprobaret. Hinc est quod Isaias propheta cum fidem gentium et futuram per spiritum cerneret excecationem Iudeorum, ait: 'Multiplicasti gentem, non magnificasti letitiam.' Multiplicata quippe gente, letitia

²⁵¹ 275A.

²⁵² 281C.

magnificata non est, quia priores patres, quamuis quidem letarentur de futura salute gentium, simul tamen doluerunt de perditione Iudeorum.²⁵³

The Lord planned etc. By plan can in fact be understood the hidden dispensation of His Incarnation. When He came in the flesh, He had a certain hidden design to reject the Jews, so that He might gather the other nations to the faith. And so it was as if He first dispersed the wall of the daughter of Zion, that is to say, He deprived the Jewish people of His protection. Then He extended the line of His inheritance to other peoples. For His line was drawn in when it was said only about the Jewish people: 'Jacob, His line of inheritance' [Deut. 32:9]. But then His line is extended when, as has been said, the allotment of the inheritance is spread over other peoples. Indeed, the blinding of the Jews preceded the illumination of other peoples as is rightly implied when it is said: 'He did not turn his hand away from perdition.' He would have turned his hand away from perdition while extending the line, if He had not rejected the Jews while gathering other peoples. This is why the prophet Isaiah said, when he saw in spirit the faith of all other peoples and the future blinding of the Jews: 'You have enlarged the people, you have not increased their joy' [Is. 9:3]. With the people indeed enlarged, joy is not enlarged, because the former Patriarchs, although they certainly rejoiced about the future salvation of other peoples, at the same time, however, grieved over the perdition of the Jews.

In this passage, the 'blinding of the Jews' - *excecatio Iudeorum* - is again cited as though a familiar concept to Hugh's audience. It resulted from God's rejection of this people, signifying its perdition. Judaism's blindness precedes and is contrasted with Christianity's enlightenment. Hugh develops this idea of the transference of religious truth from the former to the latter. He claims that now the spiritual significance of the Law has been fulfilled, the Jews' carnal observances and literal understanding of the Law are redundant.²⁵⁴

The spiritual versus carnal understanding of the Law is later on elaborated by a striking simile through which Hugh overturns the idea of Jewish antiquity, in fact opposing the Church's maturity and wisdom with Judaism's youth:

²⁵³ 278B-D.

²⁵⁴ 281C.

Senes...filie Syon prelati Ecclesie dicuntur, quorum senectus non in numero annorum queritur, sed in prouectu sapientie et morum maturitate. Et bene senes, quia non ut paruuli sub lege, quasi sub pedagogo constituti. Populus enim antiquus quasi paruulus erat, quia per uirgam legis et per terrenas promissiones nutriebatur quousque ad sensum maturum conscenderet, ut Deo non pro terrenis, sed pro celestibus deseruiet.²⁵⁵

The elders of the daughter of Zion are called the prelates of the Church, whose old age is not sought in number of years, but in the progress of wisdom and in the maturity of ways. They are rightly called elders, since they are not placed like a child under the law as though under a tutor. For the ancient Jewish people were like a child, because they were brought up by means of the rod of the Law and earthly promises, so that they might grow up to have mature understanding and thereby serve God with their eyes not on earthly matters, but on heavenly ones.

Here the Jewish people are compared to a child, the Law to his tutor brandishing the rod of correction and the promises of worldly rewards. The Church is likened to an elder. It is a convenient image, since it confronts the difficult issue of Christianity's inheritance from Judaism. Hugh acknowledges that the latter heralded the former, while at the same time setting up a hierarchy of superiority. This accords with the scheme in *De sacramentis* where the Law and Old Testament history contain the sacraments of the Christian faith, but ones of an inferior nature.

In another image, Hugh acknowledges the fact that Christianity has descended from Judaism, but still undermines the validity of the latter. The Synagogue is personified as the mother of the Church and Christ, but this woman is now barren. She is likened to a garden, no longer bearing the fruits of righteousness, whereas the Church is fruitful:

De qua et Christus carnem sumpsit, sed tamen eandem Synagoram, quia fructum iustitie non habebat, quasi hortum sterilem dissipauit. Mater ergo Christi, hoc est, Synagoga, hortus est dissipatus. Soror Christi, id est, Ecclesia, hortus conclusus.²⁵⁶

²⁵⁵ 283B-C

²⁵⁶ 275C.

It was from the Synagogue that Christ assumed flesh, but this same Synagogue is dispersed like a barren garden, because it did not bear the fruits of righteousness. Therefore, the mother of Christ, that is to say, the Synagogue, is a garden dispersed. The sister of Christ is a garden enclosed.

Hugh reinforced, then, the Christian belief in God's rejection of the Jews, using the strong image of the blinding of the Jews as if it were an actual event - a key point in history - as well as a rhetorical figure. He reinforced the supremacy of Church over Synagogue by means of contrasts between the two: spiritual versus carnal, mature versus immature, fruitful versus infertile, intact versus scattered. His allegorical exposition of Lamentations 2:5-9 (and the opening of the allegorical exposition of 2:10) achieves a striking effect. The biblical text he is expounding is understood literally as bearing witness to God's anger against the Old Testament Jews of 586 BC. Hugh's allegorical interpretation amplifies the significance of this anger, so that it now has universal proportions, rather than applying specifically to the Jewish people in 586 BC. What had been a temporary rejection by God, Hugh converts into a permanent reality. Judaism is rendered blind, disinherited, scattered, landless, barren and redundant. This reality allows a new and powerful religion to arise. The *excecatio Iudaeorum*, the blinding of the Jews, is part of the divine plan. The notion extends far beyond the image of blindness to encapsulate Jewish guilt, punishment and expulsion. An important twelfth-century thinker thus used a biblical commentary to set forth a developed treatment of a contemporary issue.

5. The Church

Hugh's interpretation of 2:6 opposes the barren, unfenced garden of the Synagogue to the fertile garden of the Church found in the Song of Songs. At 2:10, we have seen how he contrasts the two, describing Church prelates as mature, spiritual elders, while likening Jews to a youngster who needs controlling by the rod of the Law and has to be fed on promises of earthly rewards. From this point on, Hugh leaves behind the Jewish theme and devotes his allegorical exposition entirely to his contemporary Church. The passage in which he maps out the span of Jeremiah's lament serves as a transition to this new theme.²⁵⁷ His contemporary Church marks the third item (after original sin and *excecatio Iudeorum*), which is the one he has reached at this point (2:10). Moreover, he presents what has preceded this section of Lamentations as building up to this point in a crescendo:

In superioribus enim edificia diruta, menia destructa quasi a minori incipiens descripsit. Hinc iam quasi ad maiora progrediens hominum miseriam et dolorem plangit. Hec igitur que sequuntur non incongrue ad presentem Ecclesiam referri possunt.²⁵⁸

In the verses above, he described the razed building and destroyed walls as though beginning with lesser things. From here on he progresses to greater things, lamenting the wretchedness and grief of men. So the verses which follow can appropriately be referred to the present Church.

Hugh's allegorical interpretation of Lamentations 1:1-3 and Lamentations 2:10-21 is given over to the idea of Jerusalem as Church, although the treatment of the topic differs in these two sections. It is natural that this should be the dominant theme of any Lamentations commentary, since Jerusalem was a common symbol for the Church. The destruction of this city, with its doleful treatment in Lamentations, understandably suggested the Church afflicted by ills inside and out. We have seen how Paschasius, for instance, draws a clear parallel between

²⁵⁷ See above p.63-4.

²⁵⁸ 283B

God's fury at the transgressions of the Old Testament Jews and His anger against the sinfulness of Christians. Indeed, this Carolingian expositor saw the punishment exacted against Jerusalem and its inhabitants as a warning: think, he admonishes, how much worse would be the actions He would take against the Church and its members, should they continue on the path of sin.²⁵⁹ Hugh too, in his preface to the allegorical reading of 2:10, has an implicit comparison between the evils of his present-day Church and the two preceding key stages, original sin and the *excecatio Iudeorum*. But rather than presenting the evils that have beset the Jewish people as being of lesser intensity than what might befall the Church, Hugh focuses on the former, treating it as an experience peculiar to the Jewish people and one which in fact highlights the supremacy of Christianity.²⁶⁰

He does, however, go on to treat the weaknesses within the Church. But unlike Paschasius, for Hugh it is not the whole Church, root and branch, that is in disarray. The Church is not razed to the ground like its type Jerusalem. Rather, it is oppressed by the sinfulness of certain of its members, a problem exacerbated by enemies within, in particular corrupt prelates and heretics. His exposition of Lamentations 1:1-3 is, however, a case apart.

Hugh's treatment of the Church in the verses from Lamentations 1 is more hard-hitting and more akin to Paschasius's view than that which we find from 2:10 onwards. The desolation of Jerusalem is interpreted as pointing up the lack of true Christians, an idea highlighted by the very first allegorical reading:

Secundum allegorie sensum, Ieremias in Ecclesia quoslibet spirituales uiros designat, qui cum uideant multitudinem hominum ad fidem confluxisse, et nomen Christi per totum pene mundum dilatatum esse, nullos autem uel admodum paucos inueniant qui in ueritate Christum sequantur, et sincere fidem eius teneant, omnibus que sua sunt querentibus, dolentes et gementes dicunt: *Quomodo sedet sola ciuitas plena populo?* Vtquid tantum in Ecclesia populum cernimus et tamen solam esse Ecclesiam uidemus? Quia uix aliquem qui uere cum Ecclesia sit inuenire possumus.²⁶¹

²⁵⁹ See above p.37.

²⁶⁰ See above pp.77-82.

²⁶¹ 257B.

According to the allegorical sense, Jeremiah designates the spiritual men within the Church. These see that a mass of men have flooded into the faith and that Christ's name has been spread throughout almost the entire world. But they see that no-one, or very few, truly follow Christ and genuinely adhere to His faith, with everyone looking out for his own interests. And so these spiritual men grieve and groan, saying: 'How lonely sits the city full of people. How is it that we perceive so many people in the Church, but see that the Church is alone? For we can find hardly anyone who is truly with the Church.'

This bewildered speech in the mouths of true representatives of the Church, rewording as it does the biblical text, expresses in a more direct manner the absence of genuine Christians. Hugh emphasizes the point further by introducing an interpretation of an episode in Mark (5:24-34) which dramatizes the idea: Christ hemmed in by a throng of people, His garment touched by the haemorrhaging woman, asks 'Who has touched me?' The question is expounded as expressing Christ's amazement at being touched, since, despite the crowd pressing in upon Him, He felt untouched. Hugh closes the whole section with one of his neat summings up:

*Sicut ergo Christus turba premente intactus permanet, ita Ecclesia, corpus Christi inter multos sola sedet, quia fides catholica professores multos habet, imitatores paucos, sicut et tunc qui Domino prope erant per presentiam corporalem, non eum contingere poterant, quia longe erant per fidem et dilectionem.*²⁶²

Just as Christ remains untouched when the crowd presses upon Him, so the Church, body of Christ, has many who profess the Catholic faith but few imitators, as then those who were near to Christ in physical presence, could not touch Him, because they were far from Him in faith and love.

It is a stark criticism of the Church. Hugh's interpretations of 1:2-3, which are clearly influenced by Paschasius, stress the enormity of the problem. Sinfulness within the Church results in God's abandoning it to the onslaughts of enemies from within (for example, heretics and secular leaders) and without (for example,

²⁶² 257C.

pagans and Jews).²⁶³ Moreover, there are Christians who profess Christ's name, but shrink from suffering adversity on his behalf.²⁶⁴

The harsh tone of this attack on the Church is largely absent from Hugh's exposition of Lamentations 2. It is true that at 2:13, which opens the part of the poem categorized by Hugh as *increpatio*, he has the prophet addressing the Church itself about its fallen members, lamenting it in strong terms. In fact, the words apply in substance to her sinful members, but the Church is the addressee.²⁶⁵ The other instance where the sins of the Church as an entity are suggested is to be found in the interpretation of 2:10. Here, as we have seen, Hugh speaks of Jeremiah lamenting the 'evils of the present Church' ('mala presentis Ecclesie'), alongside the notions of original sin and the blinding of the Jews. But a close look at his treatment of the Church in Lamentations 2 proves that he does not put stress on its sinfulness as a whole body at all. His focus is in fact elsewhere.

The allegorical interpretation of Lamentations 2 is framed by original sin and Judgement Day, the beginning and the end of religious history, as is Hugh's theological *summa* of Church doctrine, *De sacramentis*. These two key elements of Christian teaching are set forth by Hugh in *Super Lamentationes*, enforcing the ideas by means of the emotional force of the lament expounded. The ruin of the city thus typifies the Fall; the relentless destruction of the inhabitants on 'the day of the Lord's wrath' symbolizes the *Dies irae* when no sinner shall be spared.²⁶⁶ However, actual references to core teachings of Christianity, such as the Incarnation, are notably absent from this work. Hugh focuses more on the problems rather than the solution.

The allegorical sense in *Super Lamentationes* lacks a Christological slant, which may seem strange, given the liturgical associations of this Scriptural text.²⁶⁷ Nonetheless, the sacrament of the Eucharist does draw some attention. The verse which gives rise to this is 2:11: 'Matribus suis dixerunt, "Ubi est triticum et uinum?"' ('To their mothers they say, "Where is bread and wine?").

²⁶³ 257D.

²⁶⁴ 262B.

²⁶⁵ 292A.

²⁶⁶ The section on Judgement Day relates to 2:22 (319C-322B).

²⁶⁷ See above p.24.

Understandably, the bread and wine evoke Holy Communion. The mothers are the prelates, the starving sons their congregation. The significance of the Eucharist is defined:

Quare ergo Christus triticum dicatur iam per Dei gratiam et legendo discimus et edendo sentimus. Quatuor autem modis Christum comedimus. Christum comedimus quando corporaliter sacramentum corporis et sanguinis eius sumendo spiritualiter animas nostras saginamus. Christum edimus quando Christum credendo diligimus. Christum edimus quando Christum imitamur. Christum edimus quando uerbum Dei audiendo in noue uite conuersionem transimus. Quid est ergo querere triticum nisi querere Christum, querere uerbum Dei, doctrinam ueritatis et conuersionem noui hominis? Triticum igitur querimus quando uerbum uite audire et Christum imitari desideramus. Sed si triticum edimus, uinum et non aquam bibere debemus, id est uerbum Dei audiendo sumere et per spiritualem intelligentiam illud in nobis irrigare.²⁶⁸

Why Christ is called bread we now learn through God's grace and by reading, and we sense it by eating. We eat Christ in four ways. For we eat Christ when by consuming bodily the sacrament of His body and blood, we spiritually satisfy our souls. We eat Christ when we believe in Him and love Him. We eat Christ when we imitate Him. We eat Christ when we hear the word of God and transform it into the practice of a new life. What, then, is it to ask for bread if it is not to ask for Christ, to ask for the word of God, the doctrine of truth and the practice of the new man? Therefore we seek Christ when we desire to hear the word of life and to imitate Christ. But if we eat bread, we should drink wine and not water, that is to hear and thus consume the word of God, and to water this within us by means of the spiritual understanding.

This central sacrament thus encapsulates Christian thought: spiritual sustenance, faith, love, practice, truth, conversion to a new life. Hugh compresses this into a short passage.

The only other clear instance of presentation of major tenets of Christian belief comes in the section largely devoted to the theme of *excecatio Iudeorum*. Lamentations 2:7 refers to God's rejection of the altar in the temple. Hugh interprets this altar as Christ. He links this in with his present theme by presenting

²⁶⁸ 289C-289D.

the Jews as responsible for Christ's death and therefore their own expulsion.²⁶⁹ But he also touches upon God's 'rejection' of Christ in the form of the crucifixion, summing up the reason for the Incarnation: Christ was sent as Mediator to reconcile the human race with God; God offered him up as a sacrifice for our atonement; He was sent for our sanctification.²⁷⁰ His manner of treating this crucial teaching is again concise and compressed. This may be owing to its familiarity among his audience. On the other hand, it seems possible that Hugh's focus is elsewhere, that he decided upon the themes he would cover and remained single-minded in their pursuit. Salvation history is very much in the background here, sinfulness to the fore. Hugh's interpretation of Lamentations 2:10-21 concerns sinfulness within the Church in the form of wicked prelates and heretics. But unlike Paschasius he presents the Church as fundamentally sound, though beset by enemies inside and out. The Church here is in some ways equivalent to Christ. For just as He weeps over the future punishment of his persecutors,²⁷¹ so the Church bemoans the sinners in its midst.

Hugh takes very seriously the fact that these poems are laments. For him, Jeremiah represents true Christians who weep over sinners within the Church. Compassion for the fallen and infirm in faith is a predominant theme. Take, for instance, Hugh's allegorical interpretation of 2:11:

Defecerunt pre lacrimis oculi mei etc. Propheta in persona Ecclesie membra sua plangentis enumeratis malis perditorum compassionem bonorum adiungit. Prius enim mali planguntur a bonis quam a semetipsis, et dum male sani in sua adhuc perditione exultant quantum flendi sint aliena suspiria indicant. Dicat ergo: *Defecerunt pre lacrimis oculi mei. Conturbata sunt uiscera mea. Effusum est in terra iecur meum.* Oculi in sancta Ecclesia sunt prouisoires, uiscera misericordes, iecur studiosi et in bono opere feruentes.²⁷²

My eyes have failed on account of tears etc. The Prophet in the person/character of the Church lamenting its members, having enumerated the sins of the fallen, adds the compassion of the good. The sinful are lamented by the good before they lament

²⁶⁹ 277A-C.

²⁷⁰ 277A-B.

²⁷¹ 308C.

²⁷² 285C.

themselves, and while they unhealthily persist in rejoicing in their fall, the sighs of other men show how much they ought to be bemoaned. So let it be said: 'My eyes have failed because of tears. My innards are in torment. My liver is poured out on the ground.' Eyes are those in the Church who watch over others, innards are those who are merciful, the liver is those who are zealous and fervent in their performance of good deeds.

Hugh goes on to extol compassion, equating it with true Christian love (*caritas*) and speaking of 'the feeling of brotherly compassion' ('affectus fraterne compassionis').²⁷³ It is not just that compassion is a commendable virtue, but that it is therapeutic for the prelate when he cannot save the sinners among his congregation.²⁷⁴ The fall of even one man is cause enough for the whole Church to be lamented, 'because while one member suffers all the members feel compassion' ('quia dum patitur unum membrum omnia membra compatiuntur').²⁷⁵

Compassion is made into a precept. It is the duty of the Church to weep for those within who are weak, in particular those who are subject to the vicissitudes of life, with the tears serving as a type of offering to God:

Deduc quasi torrentem lacrimas. Exhortatur propheticus sermo sanctam Ecclesiam pro membris suis infirmantibus lacrimas offerre Domino. ...Sequitur: *Per diem et noctem.* Per diem prospera, per noctem significantur aduersa. Quia ergo sancta Ecclesia quosdam per prospera huius uite decipi, quosdam per aduersa frangi conspicit, utrorumque ruinam plangens quasi per diem et noctem lacrimas educit.²⁷⁶

'Pour down tears like a torrent.' The words of the prophet exhort the Holy Church to offer tears to the Lord on behalf of its members who are weak. ...There follows: 'All day and night.' The day signifies prosperity, the night adversity. Since the Holy Church sees that some members are deceived by the prosperity of this life, some are broken by the adversity, she laments the fall of both types as though pouring down tears day and night.

²⁷³ 286A.

²⁷⁴ Ibid.

²⁷⁵ 300C-D.

²⁷⁶ 308A-B.

One would associate lament with monastic office, as Hrabanus does when interpreting this verse. For Hugh, it is the duty of the Church and its prelates. Moreover, the theme of compassion is much more to the fore in Hugh's commentary than in those of his predecessors.²⁷⁷ We have seen how it colours the literal interpretation of Lamentations, with Hugh putting the stress upon the awfulness of the calamity and the way in which Jeremiah's use of rhetoric brings this out. The allegory too is a far cry from Hrabanus's apocalyptic warnings and Paschasius's Church in disarray. It is infused with a certain humanity.

Thus, Hugh enjoins not just the Church as a whole to pity its infirm members, but prelates in particular. He compares these to mothers in that they should feel pity (*pietas*) for their flock.²⁷⁸ Certainly, throughout this section on the Church, Hugh takes the opportunity to propose a number of prescriptions for the priesthood. Take, for example, this passage where he compares it to motherhood. Here Hugh sets forth what the members of a congregation require of their spiritual leader:

Matribus suis etc. Prelati sancte Ecclesie senes prudentia atque consilio et matres pietate esse debent. ...Sciendum autem quod tribus modis uita subditorum prelatis loquitur: per miseriam, per desiderium, per obedientiam. Petunt enim quando indigent. Petunt quando desiderant. Petunt quando audire parati sunt. Per miseriam petunt quia uisa afflictorum indigentia, dum pias mentes ad subueniendum prouocat, etiamsi lingua silet, uita clamat. Per desiderium quoque petunt, quia quodammodo petere est uelle habere. Item per obedientiam petunt, quia dum paratos se ad recipiendum offerunt quasi uelle et desiderare se dicunt.²⁷⁹

'To their mothers' etc. The prelates of the Holy Church should be elders in wisdom and mothers in pity. ...But it must be known that the lives of his subjects speak to a prelate in three ways: through their suffering, through their desire, through their obedience. For they seek something when they are in need.

²⁷⁷ Compassion with its accompanying lament for the weak in the Church figures as a major theme in places other than those cited above: on 1:2 (260A); 2:13 (286D-287B), where a second allegorical interpretation is given with the elect this time rather than the Church lamenting the fallen; on 2:18 (308C) where Hugh argues that preaching should be infused with a feeling of compassion; on 2:20 (314C).

²⁷⁸ 288B.

²⁷⁹ 288B-C

They seek something when they desire something. They seek something when they are ready to hear. They seek something through their suffering, because, although their tongues are silent, the lives of the afflicted shout out, spurring on pitiful spirits to help them by their visible need. They also seek something through their desire, since in a certain way to seek is to want to have. They likewise seek through their obedience, because they offer themselves ready to receive just as they say that they want or desire something.

Here Hugh stretches the image of sons seeking food from their mothers. He is clearly concerned to draw the parallel between a mother caring for her son and the priest ministering to his congregation. The relationship between the two is not just expressed in the emotive language of maternity, but also in hierarchical terms, with the mother coming before the son.²⁸⁰ The prelate's superiority resides in his wisdom and foresight.²⁸¹

A significant portion of the allegorical interpretation of Lamentations 2 is taken up deploring corrupt ministers within the Church. But in order to highlight just how far these fall short of the ideal, Hugh defines what is expected of a priest and what his role involves. He opens the whole topic of the priesthood with an implicit contrast between Christian prelates and Jewish leaders, as embodied in the Scribes and the Pharisees, whom he attacks in the following passage:

Defixe sunt in terra porte eius etc. Quid per portas et uectes ciuitatis, nisi prelatos populi accipere debemus? Idem namque et porte sunt per uerbum, et uectes sunt per consilium, et uie per exemplum. Per uerbum disertum, porte eree, per consilium firmum, uectes ferrei, per exemplum bonum, uie plane. Porte enim sunt quando extra positos per uerbum predicationis ad fidem introducunt. Vectes sunt quando intus per fidem constitutos, per consilium salutis confirmant et dirigunt. Vie sunt quando iam incipientibus recte incedendi, per bonam operationem exemplum fiunt. ...Quid ergo sunt porte erecte, nisi doctores celestia predicantes, que bene in uectibus pendent, quia de consilio cordis firmatur uerbum predicationis?²⁸²

[Jerusalem's] gates are fixed in the earth etc. What should we understand by the gates and bolts of the city if not the prelates

²⁸⁰ 284A-B.

²⁸¹ 284C.

²⁸² 280C-281A.

of the people. For they are also gates through their words, bolts through their teaching, and roads through their example. They are bronze gates in their eloquent words, iron bolts in their firm counsel, smooth roads in their good example. For they are gates when they introduce those outside to the faith ^{through their words of preaching.} They are bolts when they strengthen and direct those within the faith through their teaching about salvation. They are roads when they become an example of how to proceed in the right way to those just setting out. ...What then are upright gates if not teachers preaching about heaven, which hang well on their hinges because the words of the preaching are strengthened by the teaching of the heart.

The prelate has a threefold task, each of which corresponds to a stage in religious life: conversion, confirmation and perfection. The prelate uses preaching to introduce outsiders to the faith. He strengthens their faith through words by teaching them about salvation. Finally he instructs them through his actions, serving as a model in his good deeds.

Preaching and teaching (or counsel, as Hugh calls it) take precedence. This involves making doctrine intelligible to one's audience, as is succinctly expressed in the formulation which is also used by Paschasius, who is drawing on Gregory, where preachers are jaws 'who break down the food of the word of God by explaining it and thus transmit it to the weak and dull-witted' ('maxille uero predicatorum qui cibum uerbi Dei exponendo comminuunt, et sic ad infirmos et sensu hebetes transmittunt').²⁸³ The image of dogma being broken down by mastication to make it digestible by the masses is commonplace.²⁸⁴ Towards the end of the commentary on Lamentations 2 we find a variant on the theme, where profound religious thought is watered down for easy consumption by those who are weak among the congregation.²⁸⁵

Hugh gives primacy to the task of preaching. A verse which begins with the words 'Rise and praise in the night' ('Consurge, lauda in nocte') is interpreted by Hrabanus Maurus as applying to monastic offices.²⁸⁶ But Hugh applies the injunction to the Church as a whole: 'The words of the Prophet tell the Holy

²⁸³ 260A.

²⁸⁴ See Philippe Buc, *L'Ambiguïté du Livre: prince, pouvoir et peuple dans les commentaires de la Bible au moyen âge* (Paris, 1994), pp.206-31.

²⁸⁵ 311A.

²⁸⁶ PL 111, 1212C.

Church to rise and praise in the night.’ (‘Monet ergo propheticus sermo sanctam Ecclesiam, ut surgat, et laudet in nocte.’)²⁸⁷ However, it is not religious devotion that is enjoined, but rather preaching: ‘For she [the Church] rises when she arouses herself from the peace of contemplation to the task of preaching on account of the salvation of those close to her, whom she sees falling headlong into ruin.’ (‘Surgit enim cum pro salute proximorum, quos periclitari uidet, de quiete contemplationis ad opus predicationis se erigit.’)²⁸⁸ Her ministers must, therefore, leave behind contemplation for this activity. Salvation of sinners is stated to be the purpose of these. Elsewhere, the terms suggest restoration and therapy. The priest is a doctor of souls,²⁸⁹ healing the injuries of sins.²⁹⁰

The theme of the duty and role of the priest is a feature in Hugh’s other works. In *De sacramentis*, the focus is more on regulations and customs than ethical prescriptions, with sections on matters such as the different grades of ecclesiastical office, the manner of ordination and liturgical vestments and vessels.²⁹¹ But in several pieces contained in the *Miscellanea*, he dwells upon what should be the priest’s duties and aims. In fact, we find several of the ideas formulated in *Super Lamentationes* scattered among various short works in this wide-ranging collection: the hierarchy of prelate and subjects;²⁹² the necessity of leading by word and deed;²⁹³ instruction in the faith of those new to it, as well as the counselling and strengthening of those already initiated;²⁹⁴ the salvation of his congregation;²⁹⁵ the medical analogy.²⁹⁶ The priest is distinguished from the contemplative.²⁹⁷ He is out in the field sowing the word of God while the latter remains in bed enjoying His sweetness.²⁹⁸

²⁸⁷ 310D.

²⁸⁸ Ibid.

²⁸⁹ 292C.

²⁹⁰ 290B.

²⁹¹ Respectively, *De sacramentis*, 2.3.4-19 (PL 176, cols 423A-431D); 2.3.20 (431D-432B); 2.4 (433B-438D).

²⁹² *Miscellanea*, 7.38 (PL 177, cols 888C-D).

²⁹³ *Miscellanea*, 1.49 (498C); 7.1 (867A).

²⁹⁴ *Miscellanea*, 4.58 (730B).

²⁹⁵ *Miscellanea*, 5.112 (806A).

²⁹⁶ *Miscellanea*, 6.16 (819C).

²⁹⁷ *Miscellanea*, 7.2 (867B-868A).

²⁹⁸ Ibid., 868A.

Nevertheless, Hugh's formulation of the theme in his various works is not uniform. Differences in focus exist between *Super Lamentationes* and these short pieces. Notably, the treatment of the priest's role in the former does not bring to the fore correction and confession, both of which are presented as fundamental to his duties in certain pieces in the *Miscellanea*.²⁹⁹ Given the presence of repentance as a theme in the tropological interpretation of Lamentations, this omission is perhaps surprising. However, it may be conscious on Hugh's part. The emphasis in *Super Lamentationes* is much more on corrupt prelates than on the sinners who make up their congregation.

Interestingly, the *Miscellanea* contain an isolated interpretation of the opening of 2:10, which is far from identical with that which we find in *Super Lamentationes*. The priest's role is defined in other terms: 'Triplex est officium sacerdotum: deambulare, sedere, docere.'³⁰⁰ ('The duty of priests is threefold: to journey about, to sit, to teach.') Each of these is elaborated. The first involves circulating around different flocks to minister to their varying needs, 'to comfort the dying, fix the broken, call back the flock which has strayed, to keep strong that flock which is so'. With reference to the priest, sitting means to hold the 'highest, spiritual rank' as prelate, his task being to stem the flow of greed and to persevere in meditation of the Scriptures. Teaching signifies by word and example. Thus prelacy includes both active pastoral care and private *lectio divina*.

The comparison here proves that Hugh did not have a fixed definition of the activities that should accompany priesthood, even when dealing with the same text, as here where it is a verse of Lamentations which is being expounded. There are shared elements such as the old men as signifying priests. But for the most part the formulation in each is independent, possible evidence of Hugh's evolving and changing ideas. There is an important distinction between *Super Lamentationes* and this short interpretation of one line, and indeed all the short pieces in the *Miscellanea* which touch upon priesthood. For the former is by far the most extensive treatment of the theme. It dominates the allegorical exposition

²⁹⁹ *Miscellanea*, 1.49 (497D-498B); 4.58 (730B); 4.130 (747D).

³⁰⁰ *Miscellanea*, 3:28 (630A).

of at least half of Lamentations 2. No other work by Hugh of any length deals with it to this degree.

The question arises again of Hugh's choice of focus, that is, of why he turns his attention to prelates in this way. The answer lies in Hugh's vocation. As a regular canon, Hugh belonged to a movement which was at the forefront of correcting perceived defects in the Church. Hugh's preoccupation with priesthood here is, I would argue, written in a spirit of reform. We have seen how he presents prescriptions for ministry. But he is all too aware that, in reality, many priests actually were falling far short of this ideal. For these come several hard-hitting attacks.

The enemies of Jerusalem allegorically become corrupt priests who endanger and injure their subjects. The Prophet himself predicted such men in large numbers:

Sed quia plerosque Propheta in sancta Ecclesia futuros preuidit, qui prelationis locum obtinentes peruersis moribus dignitatem officii sui macularent in uocem doloris erumpens sic ait: *Sederunt in terra senes filie Sion*. Quid est enim in terra sedere nisi terrenis delectationibus incumbendo a bono opere cessare?³⁰¹

But because the Prophet foresees very many in the future Holy Church, who, when they achieve their position of prelate, pollute the dignity of their office, he breaks out in a doleful voice, saying: 'The elders of the daughter of Zion sat on the earth.' What is it to sit on the earth if not to cease from good action by reclining upon earthly delights?

Such prelates fail in both the areas of word and example. It becomes hard for them to preach, for they fear exposing their own depravity. They shrink from giving voice to the Christian message, silenced by their sense of guilt.³⁰² Their subjects, the 'simple in faith' (*simplices*), witness their reluctance to preach and their attachment to worldly pleasures.³⁰³ Moreover, because they can only treat

³⁰¹ PL 175, col. 283C-D.

³⁰² 283D; cf. *Miscellanea*, 3.28 (PL 177, col. 630D).

³⁰³ 284A.

spiritual matters in a carnal way, they are unable to make anyone turn to God.³⁰⁴ Far from healing sinners, they positively encourage them by their flattery.³⁰⁵ In fact, such depraved and perverse teachers - 'prauī' or 'peruersi doctores' - lead some to perdition via the route of carnal delights.³⁰⁶

But it is not just that these ministers corrupt their subjects by their bad example; the subjects share the blame for that.³⁰⁷ For, in addition, wicked prelates exploit their flock. Hugh expresses this idea vividly in a passage in which he launches a strong critique of such prelates:

Erubescant qui de pastoribus lupi facti sunt. Erubescant qui non sicut pastores, sed sicut mercenarii gregem dominicum pascunt, qui ad laniandum sunt fortes et ad protegendum sunt imbecilles, ad accipiendum prompti, adtribuendum pigri, ad circumueniendum deserti, ad benedicendum indocti, aut plus debito exigunt, minus, uel nichil, debito impendunt, qui iudicia ueritatis in causas forenses mutauerunt. Ve eis quare non attendunt quid debeant et si petitionem preuenire noluerunt saltem petentes audiant, quia et in ipsa fortassis petitione discere etiam poterunt quid debeant.³⁰⁸

Let them feel shame who have changed from shepherds to wolves. Let them feel shame who, unlike shepherds but like mercenaries feed on their Sunday flock; who are strong at ~~butcher~~ing and weak at protecting; ready to receive and slow to give; eloquent for circumlocution, useless at saying the right thing. Either they demand more than is owed, or pay back less than is owed, or nothing at all; they who have changed judgements of truth into lawsuits. Woe for them since they do not attend to what they should and if they have not wished to ~~anticipate~~ a petition, let them at least hear the petitioners, because they could in the very petition perhaps learn what they should.

Here is an accumulation of criticisms. The rhetorical style is direct and punchy: hence the iussive subjunctives and the exclamation 'Ve eis'. The long Latin sentence with its multiple relative clauses emphasizes the extent of their exploitation and negligence. These ministers not only utterly neglect their duties,

³⁰⁴ 289D.

³⁰⁵ 290C and 294C.

³⁰⁶ 286C.

³⁰⁷ 294B.

³⁰⁸ 288D-289A; cf. *Miscellanea*, 1.49 (PL 177, col. 499B-C).

they even injure their congregation by stripping them of their wealth. Later on, Hugh explicitly states this, accusing certain priests of taking money for their ministry, when the faith of their subjects should be ample recompense.³⁰⁹ They also abuse their position by persecuting the innocent and increasing their own influence.³¹⁰

As can be clearly seen, Hugh launches an attack against corrupt and negligent prelates. The failing characters that people the Jerusalem of Lamentations 2 - old men sitting in the dust, mothers with no food for their offspring, false prophets - signify the defective ministers who populate the Church. Their deficiencies include neglect of their duties (such as preaching the faith), carnality, greed, exploitation, misuse of power and setting a bad example. Hugh turns into a Jeremiah, haranguing the representatives of Christianity just as a biblical prophet reproved his own people. The implicit analogy enforces the reforming method. Exegesis becomes invective.

Whereas inhabitants of Jerusalem symbolize deficient prelates, its enemies represent heretics. Hugh does not introduce this topic into his commentary on Lamentations 2 until he comes to the allegorical reading of verse 16: '*Aperuerunt [super te os suum omnes inimici tui]*. Inimici sancte Ecclesie heretici sunt, quia fidei eius constantiam prauis dogmatibus impugnant.'³¹¹ ('[All your enemies] opened [their mouths over you]. The enemies of the holy Church are heretics, because they attack the constancy of its faith with wicked teachings.') The military analogy is further drawn with reference to the final line of 2:17: '*Exaltauit cornu hostium tuorum*. Hostes Ecclesie heretici sunt, qui contra eam expugnandam quotidie aciem producunt.'³¹² ('He exalted the horn of your enemies. The enemies of the Church are heretics, who draw up an army everyday to take the Church by storm.') Violent imagery, then, is connected with heretics, and not just in the war symbolism, but also in the figure of devoration. They open their mouths over the Church in order to devour it. They swallow up any truth they find left over in those men they succeed in attracting to their number.³¹³ They

³⁰⁹ 314D-315A. See also 290A.

³¹⁰ 294C.

³¹¹ 302B.

³¹² 304D.

³¹³ 302C.

are also likened to serpents pouring the poison of death into their victims behind the veneer of flattering persuasion, motivated by cruelty not pity.³¹⁴ Heretics cut away limbs from the body of the Church with the sword of their teaching when they take any of her members away. They are the violators of the chastity of faith.³¹⁵ The biblical text is thus used by Hugh to associate heresy with violence and destruction.

With such power in their hands it might seem hard to ward off these enemies. But Hugh states that they are impotent while the Church maintains both wisdom and discipline among its members. If the Church loses either or both of these, it lays itself open to attack. In other words, heretics can only succeed when she is vulnerable.

Hugh concedes that they win victories, because they do manage to lead some from the true Christian path. However, he deprives them of autonomy, presenting them as God's instruments when He wishes to test the faith of Christians. The questioning of heretics exercise these members of the Church, causing them to achieve a deeper understanding of the truth.³¹⁶

Hugh only discusses heretics in relation to a cluster of verses towards the end of Lamentations 2 (2:16-18, 21). His attack specifies no actual target. One wonders whether Hugh was simply treating a *topos*, or had some particular heresies in mind. Heresy is not, however, a dominant theme in his allegorical interpretation, although with the analogy between sacked Jerusalem and embattled Church, one might think he had ample opportunity to develop the subject to the full. The verses he chooses to apply to it are utterly relevant, because they concern the foe outside, which heretics, along with pagans and Jews, were perceived as being.³¹⁷ But I would argue that Hugh is more concerned with the enemy within in the form of corruption among priests.

The Scriptural text, which during Easter week was applied to the Passion, is interpreted by Hugh not to deal with the theme of the Crucifixion, but rather to highlight the ills afflicting the Church. The allegorical interpretation of 2:10-21

³¹⁴ Ibid.

³¹⁵ 317B (on 2:21)

³¹⁶ 304B-C.

³¹⁷ See on 1:1 (257D).

has a twofold force. It is both lament and invective; lament by the Church as a whole for its fallen members; invective against those who pervert Christianity. Whereas the other main commentaries before Hugh's evoked the monastic tendency to grieve^{for} the world outside, Hugh's own exposition centres on the interaction of the Church with the world outside, in particular the way in which corrupt prelates and dangerous heretics undermine the faithful. The former group attract the most attention here. The motivation behind Hugh's attack is the reforming spirit which characterizes his vocation as a regular canon. He has a strong sense of what role the priest should fulfil with relation to his subjects and how this position is often abused. Exegesis becomes, therefore, the medium for strong censure. /

vi. Concluding Remarks

Since Hugh commented upon only the first three verses of Lamentations 1 and the whole of Lamentations 2, it would seem natural to assume that *Super Lamentationes* is not a cohesive text, but two separate compositions. A close look at Hugh's interpretation of these parts provides us with internal evidence for this. The prologue and rhetorical analysis of Lamentations 2 prove that Hugh's exposition of this chapter is distinct from that of Lamentations 1:1-3. The clear thematic structure of the allegorical interpretation of 2 is further corroboration. Hugh's treatment of Lamentations 1 has its own features, in particular, the predominance of the moral sense and the references to changes of sense. It reads like a model in the threefold exposition of a biblical text.

A striking feature of Lamentations 2 is its departure from this rigid scheme, at least to begin with. We have seen how a whole run of verses are given their literal reading, rising in a crescendo of lament. Then, the first few verses of the chapter are resumed, this time according to an interpretation which merges allegory and tropology. This breakdown in organization could be owing to a choice on Hugh's part. He may have felt that interrupting the structure in this way enabled him to develop a theme at length. Alternatively, what we have may represent one of the several unfinished works which Hugh left behind. The material would possibly have been reorganized at a later stage, when, for example, the literal interpretation of 2:11 would have been put before the allegorical sense. But it is hard to see how he would have extricated the allegorical from the moral sense in the case of 2:1-4.

It cannot be denied, however, that Hugh had a very strong sense of structure in his interpretation of Lamentations 2. The allegorical interpretation shares the same boundary-lines with *De sacramentis*, opening with original sin and closing with Judgement Day at the end of time. In *Super Lamentationes* what comes between these outer limits follows a chronological plan, with *excecatio Iudeorum* preceding the evils afflicting the Church. Such a framework is unique in interpretations of Lamentations, at least among those commentators we have

discussed. Moreover, he is not sidetracked from this structure, even though this is line-by-line exegesis.

Hugh's sense of order is a characteristic feature evident in this work. There is also, on the whole, a notable clarity of expression throughout. We find, too, a certain independence. Although he derives features from past authorities, he reworks his sources in a way which marks his commentary as distinctive. We have seen how he inherits ideas from Paschasius, and adapts them to suit his own interests. It is worth noting this individuality, at a time of 'traditionalist' exegesis as exemplified by the *Glossa ordinaria*, in which patristic and Carolingian exposition is excerpted and compiled to create standardized commentaries.

Super Lamentationes is hard to categorize. It has elements that remind us of Hugh's role as a teacher, in particular in the references to rhetoric. The tropological interpretation evokes aspects we would associate with a monastic milieu, with Hugh the religious. But the allegorical interpretation reveals the concerns of a theologian and a regular canon. This work of exegesis serves, therefore, a variety of purposes, educational, spiritual, doctrinal and homiletic. It provides us with a valuable source for medieval ideas and images, such as the blindness of the Jews.

The question remains of why Hugh chose to comment at such length on this minor book. In the case of *In Ecclesiasten*, it is clear that he had reasons for choosing Ecclesiastes. It allowed him to set forth his quasi-Neoplatonic ideas on the ascent from the visible to the invisible. With regard to Lamentations, there is no simple answer. As a teacher of *lectio divina*, he may have been attracted to it, given its association with the threefold scheme. As a theologian, he may have been drawn to the subject-matter, since it enabled him to address the Jewish issue. Moreover, this biblical text may have given him space to develop themes as he wished. The other twelfth-century commentaries prior to Hugh's, in particular those of Guibert of Nogent and Rupert of Deutz, bear witness to a certain flexibility in the treatment of Lamentations. I would suggest, however, that Hugh selected Lamentations because of the association between Jerusalem and the Church. Jeremiah's threnody on the destruction of Jerusalem thus turned into a lament for the Church, whose very foundations were in Hugh's eyes threatened by

the misconduct of her own ministers. Hugh chose Lamentations largely because of his role as a regular canon and reformer.

III. THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF HUGH OF ST VICTOR'S *SUPER LAMENTATIONES*.

1. Introduction

It is necessary to examine the manuscript tradition, in order to establish a critical edition of *Super Lamentationes*. Such a study will enable us to group the witnesses, distinguish reliable from corrupt readings, identify revisions and address the issue of the text's cohesiveness. It will also shed light upon the whole history of the text, its dissemination, readership and reception.

It does not entail from the fact that *Super Lamentationes* was composed by a figure of considerable standing in his own day and beyond, that it had any influence or significance in the twelfth century or later. Certain compositions by Hugh had only a limited audience, such as his pedagogical handbooks, *De grammatica* and *Practica geometrie*.³¹⁸ By studying the manuscripts which contain *Super Lamentationes*, we can, to a certain extent, discover how important a text it was in the Middle Ages, how much it was copied and how widespread its diffusion. We can also trace who might have been influenced by this text, by identifying the institutions which owned it.

Study of the manuscripts will also elucidate the question of why this work was copied and read. The above discussion of the work and its themes has shown that *Super Lamentationes* does not fit into a simple category. It is natural to describe it as a work of exegesis, because it is a line-by-line exposition of a biblical text. But it shares elements with other genres, such as sermons and doctrinal treatises. Features of the actual manuscripts can reveal whether the modern categories that we find in the *Patrologia Latina*, such as exegetical, dogmatic and mystical, actually reflect medieval classifications.

In what follows, the investigation of the manuscript evidence has a twofold aim. It will both establish the work's textual tradition and explore its cultural history. First, external evidence for the transmission of the text in the

³¹⁸ According to Goy, *Überlieferung*, pp.11-14, each of these is contained in seven extant manuscripts.

twelfth-century will be discussed. Then, the manuscript groups will be presented in turn. After this, I shall compare the different groups, focusing in particular on problematic readings, where there is significant disagreement. Finally, I shall take an overview of the manuscript evidence, drawing general conclusions about the significance of *Super Lamentationes* in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries.

i. Evidence for Medieval Production of Hugh's Works

External evidence exists for the textual tradition of Hugh's *oeuvre*. A fifteenth-century manuscript contains a list of his writings known as the *Indiculum*.³¹⁹ Its rubric states that it is comprehensive: 'Indiculum omnium scriptorum Magistri Hugonis de Sancto Victore quae scripsit.' ('The catalogue of all the works which Master Hugh of St Victor wrote.') The closing words offer proof that Gilduin, abbot of St Victor, undertook the posthumous edition of the entire body of Hugh's works: '...sed post mortem eius abbas Geldewinus collegit omnia insimul et fecit quattuor uolumina.' ('...but after his death the Abbot Gilduin collected together all his works and made four volumes.') Since Gilduin died in 1155, this enterprise must have taken place during the decade following Hugh's death in 1141. The Victorine project to edit Hugh's *oeuvre* is of direct relevance to the manuscript tradition, because there are, among the twelfth-century witnesses, several large-scale collections of Hugh's works and, in particular, one from St Victor itself.

ii. Manuscript Groups

I have categorized the majority of manuscripts into groups according to their shared errors. The groups are denoted by the Greek letters Σ , Δ , Ω , Θ and Φ . There are a few manuscripts which I have been unable to relate to these groups, either because they have independent errors, or because I have collated them only

³¹⁹ Oxford, Merton College, 49, ff.81^r-82^v. The *Indiculum* of Merton Coll., 49 has been edited by J. de Ghellinck, *Recherches de science religieuse* 1, 1910, 270-89 and 385-96. This manuscript, O4, also happens to contain a copy of the *Super Lamentationes* and belongs to a group^(A) which shares the archetype of the Σ manuscripts. See below pp.150-1.

in part. Descriptions of these are included after the last group, Φ . There are also a few witnesses which I have not seen at all. These are enumerated in the section concerning the ungrouped manuscripts, with relevant information given where this can be gathered from catalogue descriptions.

Three of the five groups include subgroups; the Σ and Δ groups have two each, and the Φ group has four. Within two groups, Σ and Φ , there are other witnesses which appear independent of the subgroups. These are treated after the subgroups.

Each of the five groups is dealt with in turn. First, the manuscripts belonging to the group are described. Then, the significant variants which characterize the group are presented. The variants which identify each subgroup, in the cases where there is a subgroup, follow those of the group as a whole.

The manuscript descriptions are far from exhaustive. They have the clear aim of providing evidence which is relevant to the manuscript tradition, both in terms of textual filiations and the reception of the work. For example, three members of the Θ group, *Re*, *T1* and *T2*, have several identical works with similar titles, proof of a close relationship between them. They also contain two works which accompany *Super Lamentationes* in other non-related witnesses, namely Hugh of Fouilloy's *De claustro anime* and Richard of St Victor's *Beniamin minor*, evidence for the types of writing with which *Super Lamentationes* was classed.

The descriptions draw attention, therefore, to particular details which offer evidence for the manuscript tradition. The information is taken both from catalogue descriptions and from firsthand consultation of over half of the volumes. On occasion, I supplement the former, where relevant data is missing, and I amend it, where I judge there to be a mistake, especially with regard to dating.

For the sake of clarity, I have opened each description by presenting palaeographical data in abbreviated form. This presentation will facilitate easy reference, identifying at once the following important aspects of the manuscript, where known: date, provenance, authors contained, size, whether composite, and decoration. This essential information is followed by a discussion of aspects I

judge revealing for the transmission and reception of the work: proof of provenance, be it an *ex libris* or the presence of a letter or text which localizes the manuscript in any way; precisions about dating, for instance, whether it is the first half of the twelfth century or not; the general nature of the manuscript, that is to say, whether it is a collection of Hugh's writings or a miscellany; what other writings by Hugh accompany the text (I highlight the actual rubrics given in the manuscript by the use of bold); the presence of particular works by authors other than Hugh, where this is revealing.

I shall also discuss the presentation of *Super Lamentationes*. The way in which the text is divided sheds light upon the issue of its cohesiveness, elucidating whether this was originally one work or two separate pieces. The use of sense headings will show how medieval readers responded to the structural problems of the exposition of Lamentations 2. *Mise-en-page* is difficult evidence to interpret, but may offer clues to the types of usage to which *Super Lamentationes* was put, possibly suggesting whether, for instance, it was studied in a scholastic context.

Additions to *Super Lamentationes* will also be explored, such as the presence of the biblical text itself before, or within, the commentary, the inclusion of related or supplementary material, and the use of any introductory notes or marginalia.

Obviously, not all manuscripts provide such evidence. Furthermore, a few are important witnesses, such as that from St Victor itself, or are otherwise distinctive, as in the case of *Di* from Cîteaux. These are given, therefore, greater attention than the rest.

2. The Manuscripts

i. Σ Group

s.xii

Eton, College Library, 38, <i>post correctionem</i> (Gloucester region) ³²⁰	E
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 1917	P3
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2527 (Foucarmont, Cistercian)	P2
Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 717 (St Victor)	V
Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica, Ross. 227	Va1

s.xii/xiii

London, British Library, Add. 19885	L1
-------------------------------------	----

s.xiii

London, British Library, Royal 5. E. XIV	L2
Mâcon, Bibliothèque de la ville, 84 (Cluny, Benedictine)	Ma

s.xiii/xiv

Oxford, New College, 144	O2
--------------------------	----

s.xv

Cambridge, University Library, Ee. VI. 26	Ca2
Munich, Staatsbibliothek Clm 26818 (Regensburg, Franciscan)	Mu

³²⁰ E originally belonged to another group (Δ), but was later contaminated by a Σ exemplar. See below pp.141-3.

This group contains the only manuscript (V) whose provenance is St Victor itself. That fact alone ensures that the Σ group is of great importance to the history of *Super Lamentationes*. The interesting question of V's relation to Abbot Gilduin's project of collecting Hugh's entire output will be considered in my discussion of this manuscript.

The Σ group as a whole is related to the Δ group: they originally shared an archetype. In the twelfth century, the Σ version had a wide diffusion, extending westwards as far as the Gloucester area of England and possibly as far south as Northern Italy. Thereafter, it travelled further afield, and, by the fifteenth century, was to be found in Southern Germany.

According to the existing evidence, this version circulated amongst a variety of orders. Regular canons, friars, black and white monks contributed to its dissemination. It is perhaps worth noting that, in the thirteenth century at least, this was possibly the version kept in the important Benedictine library of Cluny.

The Σ group falls into two subgroups on the grounds of textual evidence.

Σ^1 Subgroup

s.xii

Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 717 (St Victor) V

s.xiii

Mâcon, Bibliothèque de la ville, 84 (Cluny, Benedictine) Ma

s.xv

Munich, Staatsbibliothek Clm 26818 (Regensburg, Franciscan) Mu

Descriptions

V Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 717³²¹

s.xii; St Victor, Augustinian; collection of works by Hugh; 212 folios; 402 x 294mm; 2 columns of 40 lines; coloured initials.

The provenance of V is certain. On folio 1^r, there is a thirteenth-century *ex libris* from St Victor:

I H S Maria - S. Victor - S. Augustinus

Iste liber est Sancti Victoris parisiensis. Quicumque furatus
fuerit uel celauerit uel istum deleuerit, anathema sit. Amen.

Since the whole manuscript is dedicated to works by Hugh and constitutes an important witness to the text, I set out its contents in full.³²²

f.1^{ra} *Libellus de formatione arche*

f.9^{ra} *De archa Noe pro archa sapientie cum archa Ecclesie et archa matris
gratie*

f.30^{rb} *De institutione novitiorum*

f.41^{ra} *Practica geometrie*

f.51^{ra} *Epitoma Dindimi in philosophiam*

f.54^r *De grammatica*

f.74^{ra} (Last lines of *De uirtute orandi*)

*De solutione quatuor questionum per Ranulphum de Mauriaco
propositarum*

f.74^{vb} (Prologue to the *Didascalicon*)

f.75^{ra} *Didascalicon Hugonis de studio legendi*

³²¹ *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine* (Paris, 1885), I, pp.330-1.

³²² From folio 178^r, onwards, there are multifarious short pieces by Hugh, most of which have been collected in *Miscellanea* 1. A list of their titles can be found in R. Baron, 'Etude sur l'authenticité de l'oeuvre de Hugues de Saint-Victor d'après les manuscrits Paris Mazarine 717, BN 14506 et Douai 360-366', *Scriptorium*, X (1956), 183-9.

- f.98^{ra} *De sacramentis*, 1.1.9-30
- f.101^{va} *Super Lamentationes Ieremie*
- f.124^{ra} *De uanitate rerum mundanarum*
- f.136^{rb} *De tribus diebus*
- f.144^{ra} *Incipit prologus in Soliloquium de arrha anime...Incipit Soliloquium de arrha anime*
- f.150^{ra} *Incipit tractatus de laude caritatis... Explicit prologus. Incipit tractatus*
- f.151^{vb} *De substantia dilectionis*
- f.152^{vb} *Prologus in tractatum de uirtute orationis*
- f.156^{ra} *De meditatione*
- f.157^{ra} *Miscellanea* 1.1
- f.159^{va} *De uerbo incarnato, Collatio III*
- f.160^{va} (Sermon which begins 'Egredietur uirga et flos de radice Iesse')³²³
- f.161^{rb} (extract which begins 'Maria porta Christus homo et Deus')³²⁴
- f.161^{va} *De uerbo incarnato, Collatio II*
- f.162^{ra} *De quatuor uoluntatibus in Christo*
- f.163^{va} *De cibo Emmanuelis* (= *Miscellanea* 1.2)
- f.165^{ra} *Incipit tractatus de sapientia Christo et sapientia Christi prologus*
- f.165^{rb} *Incipit tractatus*
- f.168^{vb} *De uirginitate beate Marie ...Explicit prologus. Incipit liber de incorrupta uirginitate matris Domini*
- f.173^{vb} *De uerbo incarnato, Collatio I*
- f.176^{va} *De unione corporis et spiritus*
- f.178^{ra} *Miscellanea* 1.81-91; 5.13; 1.92; 1.99; 1.93-99; 1.100-105, 107-117; 1.60
- f.183^{va} *De apparitione Christi duobus discipulis euntibus in castellum quod dicitur Emmaus* (= *Misc.* 1.100)
- f.187^{va} *De potestate et uoluntate Dei* (part)
- Miscellanea* 1.118-119, 121-135, 137-151; 1.76; 1.153-158.
- f.193^{vb} *Excerpta de libro Psalmorum*
- f.208^{vb} *Institutiones in Decalogum*

³²³ Ed. R. Baron, 'La pensée mariale de Hugues de Saint-Victor', *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*, 31 (Toulouse, 1955), 269-71

³²⁴ *Ibid.*, 271.

f.210^{va} *De quinque septenis*

f.212^{rb} *De uerbo Dei*

It is clear from this list of contents that *V* constitutes an extensive collection of Hugh's works. It includes a range of material from lengthy treatises to short pieces. These concern a variety of topics, such as class-room education, spiritual formation, theological questions and biblical interpretation.

In format, *V* is one of the largest manuscripts containing *Super Lamentationes*. The end of the volume is missing, for the final text breaks off mid-sentence at the bottom of the last folio. Two works within the manuscript lack a beginning.³²⁵ There is evidence of piecework copying: blank folios frequently follow certain works, indicating that some texts were copied in separate quires and only later brought together in a collection. Furthermore, there is a certain lack of finish: several titles are missing, notably for the first work and also for *Super Lamentationes*. Space is, however, left for them to be added afterwards by a rubricator.

There is evidence that later copyists felt the need to fill in gaps in the manuscript. There are two short sections in Gothic script dating possibly from the fifteenth century. On folio 69^r, *De grammatica* is continued in this later script, as is *De substantia dilectionis* from folio 152^{ra}. From folio 152^{vb} to 155^{vb}, *De uirtute orandi* is added in the same Gothic script. Moreover, a folio earlier in the manuscript (74^{ra}), which probably opens a quire,³²⁶ begins with the concluding lines of *De uirtute orationis* in a twelfth-century hand. The quire which contains the earlier copy of this work, to which these lines are a conclusion, is missing. These later additions serve as evidence that *V* was either unfinished or subsequently damaged.

³²⁵ *De uirtute orandi*, of which there are only the last lines on f.74^{ra}, and *De sacramentis*, 1.1.9-30 which starts mid-sentence on f.98^{ra}.

³²⁶ I have not yet studied the collation of *V*. However, folio 73^v is blank and follows the conclusion of a work, which suggests the end of a quire.

The relationship between V and Gilduin's edition

An important question is whether V corresponds to any of the volumes of Hugh's writings produced as a result of Abbot Gilduin's initiative in the 1140s. This is not an easy problem to resolve. Compared with the other extant witnesses containing *Super Lamentationes*, V is the fullest collection of Hugh's works, containing, for instance, the greatest number of short pieces. A substantial proportion of Hugh's output is in the form of such *opuscula*. This process of collection, when considered alongside V's provenance, supports the view that it represents part of the copying overseen by Gilduin in the mid-twelfth century.

Further evidence in favour of such a claim is the notable overlap between V's contents and the works listed in the *Indiculum* as belonging to volumes one and two of Gilduin's edition. There are, however, some notable omissions. V does not include the following (I cite the titles used in the *Indiculum*): *Chronica*, *Distinctiones*, *Notule super Pentateuch et librum Regum*, *Canticum pro assumptione Virginis Marie*, *Sermo super dominicam orationem*, *De creatione mundi* (= *De sacramentis legis naturalis et scripte*), *Super Canticum Marie*, *Prolixior tractatus super dominicam orationem*, *Sermo 'Ibo mihi ad montem'* (= *De amore sponsi ad sponsam*).³²⁷ Furthermore, there are works in V which are not mentioned in the *Indiculum*. The first discrepancy could be explained by the possibility that certain works were lost when Gilduin's first and second volumes were later bound into one copy; it has already been mentioned that a few works are interrupted. A possible resolution to the second difficulty depends on whether it is acceptable for those works not listed in the *Indiculum* to be covered by the following term: 'huiusmodi expositiones et diuersarum sententiarum infinite sunt in hoc uolumine.'³²⁸ However, neither of these difficulties can be conclusively overcome.

Palaeographical evidence might prove whether this copy dated from the period of Gilduin's project or later. But this too has seemed to me to be problematic. Certain features support dating to the mid-twelfth century,

³²⁷ R. Baron, 'Etude sur l'authenticité', p.182.

³²⁸ Baron suggests this as a possibility: 'Etude sur l'authenticité', pp.184.

Others seem to suggest later copying, most notably the small round 's' used not just as the final letter of a word, but also sometimes at the beginning (and even in the middle) of words. The sloped-backed 'd' has an ascender which is sharply bent over, closely hugging the bowl of the letter. These details would appear to be uncommon for this period.³²⁹ But even if *V* does not contain part of Gilduin's edition, it is more than likely that it derived from this version.

Given this manuscript's provenance and its association with Gilduin's initiative, it would be tempting to infer that *V* represents the text closest to that composed by Hugh. However, caution should be exercised in making such an assumption. Even if *V* had been transcribed at Gilduin's bidding, it is likely that earlier copies of the texts it contains were already in circulation. It was, after all, most probably written by Hugh well over a decade before Gilduin's project. Furthermore, certain omissions are peculiar to the Σ group, which prove that *V* cannot have served as an archetype for all the copies of the text.³³⁰ The intensive copying of all of Hugh's *oeuvre* was a massive undertaking and probably resulted at times in mistakes. In his edition of the *Practica Geometrie*, Baron qualifies his good opinion of *V* as follows: '... le texte est de qualité. Il a pourtant besoin d'être soutenu, et parfois d'être corrigé et complété.'³³¹

Nevertheless, this Victorine manuscript is an important witness. Although only two other Σ manuscripts descend from *V*, it has the least errors of the group. Moreover, when compared with all the extant witnesses of this commentary, it has the fewest omissions. It also served as an exemplar for later copies. There are marginal notes from folio 157^{ra} onwards in a hand which possibly dates from the fifteenth century, giving directions to scribes on where to start and end their transcription (notes such as 'Usque hic<,> scribe'; 'Incipe'; 'Scribe<,> scribere usque ibi *queris de uoluntate*').

³²⁹ To discover whether such features characterize the script used at St Victor at this time, it would be necessary to examine transcriptions made by scribes who have been identified as Victorine. A starting-point might be Françoise Gasparri, *L'écriture des Actes de Louis VI, Louis VII et Philippe-Auguste* (Geneva, 1973).

³³⁰ See below pp.128-9.

³³¹ R. Baron, *Hugonis de Sancto Victore Opera Propaedeutica* (Notre Dame, 1966), p.7.

Presentation of *Super Lamentationes*

The commentary has no rubric either at the beginning or at the end, nor is there any remark signalling the beginning of the commentary on Lamentations 2. However, the commentary on Lamentations 1 is followed by eleven empty lines, before the prologue to the exposition of Lamentations 2, which begins ‘Medicus noster’ (264C). The initial of ‘Medicus’ is a *littera notabilior* of average size, smaller than the initial to the opening ‘Quomodo’ of the allegorical interpretation of Lamentations 2. However, the gap does mark off this prologue from the preceding text, but is otherwise not easy to interpret. The space may have been left for an explicit to the exposition of Lamentations 1, followed by a new title for that of Lamentations 2. A further possibility is that there was a long note mentioning the incompleteness of the commentary on Lamentations 1 and the fullness of that on the second poem.

Another gap is left at the end of the literal interpretation of a sequence of verses (2:1-9). The allegorical interpretation begins on the recto of the following folio, with a large initial. Thus the text is divided into three sections, the commentary on Lamentations 1, the literal exposition of Lamentations 2:1-9 and the allegorical interpretation of 2:1 onwards.

In V, the commentary is clearly presented. The openings of lemmata are distinguished from exposition by the use of small capitals. The words ‘Sequitur’ or ‘Vnde sequitur’ which introduce a lemma are also put in upper case. The commentary is divided by means of *pieds de mouche*. These are used to signal changes of sense. In the commentary on Lamentations 1, they are employed exclusively for the literal sense. The allegorical and moral senses are indicated by red abbreviated headings placed in the line: *Al*, *MOR*. Likewise, in the commentary on Lamentations 2, *pieds de mouche* mark changes of sense. They are also employed for other purposes, most notably to divide up the five rhetorical sections as enumerated in the prologue to the exposition of the second poem (264D), as well as to draw attention to passages of particular interest, such as the excursus on the four ways in which we eat Christ (289C-D). These were most likely added by a later reader.

What should be noted from such evidence is that this important witness only used sense headings within the text for the allegorical and moral interpretations of Lamentations 1:1-3, but that these are totally absent from the interpretation of Lamentations 2. This pattern we shall see repeated in other manuscripts.

Ma **Mâcon, Bibliothèque de la ville, 84**³³²

s.xiii; Cluny, Benedictine; collection of works first by Richard, then by Hugh; 373ff.; 285 x 200mm; 2 columns of 54 lines; coloured initials of red and blue.

This manuscript probably dates from the second half of the thirteenth century. It is surprisingly long, given the manuscript's appearance as a unitary collection. Throughout there are running headers referring both to the names of the author: 'RICARDUS' or 'HUGO', and to the title of the work. 'HUGO' occurs even in the sections from *De claustro anime*, which, in its explicit, is correctly attributed to Hugh of Fouilloy. It also occurs in a text ascribed to Cyprian, *De duodecim abusioibus seculi*. Interestingly, the final folios are devoted to a fourteenth-century index to the collection. This is organized according to themes rather than titles of works, providing evidence that it was treated very much as one body of texts.

The contents of the manuscript are:

f.1^{ra} ('Capitula' list for the *De tabernaculo federis*); *Incipit maior contemplatio*

Magistri Ricardi de Sancto Victore (=De tabernaculo federis).

f.38^{va} *Incipiunt capitula in contemplationem minorem que dicitur Benjamin*

f.59^{vb} *De mensa per quam designatur uita actiua*

f.63^{ra} *De candelabro quod figurat uitam prelati*

f.68^{va} *De tabernaculo super intelligentiam anagogiam*

f.87^{vb} *Incipit tractatus Ricardi de iv gradibus caritatis*

³³² CG, 42, pp.279-80.

- f.92^{ra} *Incipit expositio Ricardi de uisionibus Danielis*
- f.134^{va} *Incipit tractatus Ricardi uenerabilis prioris de potestate iudicandi*
- f.155^{rb} *Incipit expositio Ricardi super Apocalypsin*
- f.215^{ra} *Defloraciones quedam de libro Psalmorum*
- f.251^{ra} *De exterminatione mali et promotione boni*
- f.252^{va} *Didascalicon. Hugo de studio legendi*
- f.271^{vb} *Tractatus Super Lamentationes Ieremie*
- f.290^{va} *Incipit prologus Magistri Hugonis de laude caritatis*
- f.290^{vb} *Incipit tractatus (De laude caritatis)*
- f.292^{ra} *Incipit prologus de studio orandi; Incipit liber de uirtute orandi*
- f.295^{rb} *Incipit tractatus de institutione nouiter conuersorum ad religionem morum maximam docens informationem*
- f.303^{rb} *Responsio Magistri Hugonis de Sancto Victore super quinque dubitationibus*
- f.303^{va} *Incipit libellus Sancti Cipriani episcopi et martyris de duodecim abusiuis seculi* (= Pseudo-Cyprian)
- f.307^{va} *Incipit prologus in soliloquium de arrha anime;*
Incipit soliloquium de arrha anime
- f.312^{rb} *Incipit prologus in primo libro de claustro anime* (followed by the whole of *De claustro anime*)
- f.361^v *Explicit liber quartus et ultimus de claustro anime compositus ab Hugone, priore canonicorum Sancti Laurencii in pago Ambianensi*
- f.362^r -373 (s.xiv index to the contents, listing topics rather than works)

The manuscript thus contains eleven texts by Richard, eight by Hugh, one attributed to Saint Cyprian and one by Hugh of Fouilloy. In addition to *Super Lamentationes*, *Ma* shares three other texts by Hugh with *V*, all of which are copied in a block: *De laude caritatis*, *Soliloquium de arrha anime* and *De uirtute orandi*, the first two of which have matching rubrication. *Ma*, like *V*, gives no rubric for *Super Lamentationes*; this is striking in *Ma* since no other text lacks a rubric. However, throughout the section devoted to this work, there is the running title ‘Super Threnos’.

It is worth noting the presence of Hugh of Fouilloy's *De clauastro anime*. Despite the scribe's correct ascription, the continuation of the running title 'HUGO' above the text-block could easily lead to the mistaken association of the work with the Victorine Hugh. We will find that this work is copied in a number of manuscripts with *Super Lamentationes*.

In terms of its presentation of the commentary, *Ma* does not share *V*'s divisions marked by empty lines and new folios. A *littera notabilior* is, however, used for the initial of the prologue to Lamentations 2 and the opening of the allegorical interpretation of 2:1. Like *V*, *Ma* incorporates sense headings in the line throughout the commentary on Lamentations 1. For this part of the commentary, *Ma* underlines the lemmata to distinguish them from the exposition.

Mu **Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 26818**³³³

s.xv; Regensburg, Franciscan; Bernard, Hugh and Peter of Cluny; 274ff.; parchment and paper; single column of 30-36 lines.

The manuscript contains two works by Hugh:

f.211^v *Incipit expositio uenerabilis Hugonis de Sancto Victoris super Threnis Ieremie*

f.246^v-250^v *De miseria mundi* (= *De uanitate mundi*)

Mu shares both texts with *V*, but ascribes different titles to them. In the case of *Super Lamentationes*, it is worth noting the use of the word 'Threni', which *Ma* employs in its running title.

An innovation in *Mu* is the introduction of the Hebrew letter with reference to Lamentations 1:1-2 thus:

'Aleph. Secundum allegorie sensum...' (1:1)

³³³ C. Halm and G. Laubmann, *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis* (Munich, 1874-1881), II.4, p.216.

‘Aleph. Secundum sensum allegorie...’ (1:2)
‘Aleph. Secundum sensum moralem...’ (1:2)

Throughout the rest of the commentary, there are no more sense headings.

In the margin next to the opening lemma of 2:1 is a note signalling the change of chapter here (‘Capitulum ii’). The only noticeable division marked in the text itself is for the allegorical intepretation of 2:1.

Σ² Subgroup

s.xii

Eton, College Library, 38, <i>post correctionem</i> (Gloucester region) ³³⁴	E
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 1917	P3
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2527 (Foucarmont, Cistercian)	P2

s.xii/xiii

London, British Library, Add. 19985	L1
-------------------------------------	----

s.xiii/xiv

Oxford, New College, 144	O2
--------------------------	----

³³⁴ See footnote 320.

Descriptions

P2 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2527³³⁵

s.xii; Foucarmont (diocese of Rouen), Cistercian; Hugh, Richard and Hildebert of Lavardin; 110ff.; 320 x 215mm; single column of 40-43 lines; red painted or coloured initials and rubrication.

The script suggests a dating towards the end of the twelfth century (for example, there is a complete absence of the cedilla on 'e' for 'ae'). Traces of an *ex libris* on folio 1^r indicate the provenance of Foucarmont. *P2* is largely devoted to works by Hugh, but does include one each by Richard and by Hildebert of Lavardin respectively. The texts by (or attributed to) Hugh and Richard are as follows (a cross denotes a false attribution):

f.1^r *In Ecclesiasten I-XII*

f.32^v *Incipit tractatus super Lamentationes Ieremie Prophete item a Magistro*

Hugone Sancti Victoris Parisiensis

f.55^v *De Spiritu sancto tentatur Scriptura+*

f.56^v *Miscellanea 5.28, 27 and 77; 1.77*

f.57^r *De assumptione Beate Virginis Marie*

f.61^r *Allegorie in Nouum Testamentum (2.3)+
Summa sententiarum (6.3)+*

f.63^v *De quinque septenis*

f.65^r *De substantia dilectionis*

f.67^r *Soliloquium de arrha anime*

f.73^r *De uirtute orandi*

f.79^r *De tribus diebus*

f.87^r *Beniamin minor (Richard)*

³³⁵ BN, II, pp.502-3.

P2 shares six works with *V*. However, it includes other texts by Hugh not in *V*, two of which are false attributions. It is worth noting that *Super Lamentationes* is preceded by another ‘exegetical’ work (in terms of its use of line-by-line interpretation), his *In Ecclesiasten*.

Unlike *V* and *Ma*, *P2* has a full title at the head of the commentary. However, it also includes a marginal note written neatly in a contemporary hand (possibly, even, the same hand as that of the text-block) in a coloured box. This note, which will prove to be of considerable significance for the textual history of this commentary, is as follows: ‘Sciendum est quod in hoc uolumine non describit Magister Hugo nisi tres primas litteras primi alphabeti et secundum alphabetum ex integro.’ Moreover, just before the prologue to Lamentations 2 (264C), there is the following rubrication: ‘Hic incipit de secundo alphabeto.’ A new departure is also signalled here by the large initial ‘M’ of ‘Medicus’, four lines in length. The only other points where initials of such a size are used are for the opening ‘Q’ of the commentary on Lamentations 1 and that of the allegorical interpretation of Lamentations 2:1 onwards; in the latter case, the words which precede this opening finish in the middle of a line, the rest completed with a line-filler. So *P2* divides the work as a whole in the same manner as *V*. Unlike *V*, however, it includes no sense headings whatsoever, though in the commentary on Lamentations 1 the allegorical and moral interpretations of 1:1-3 are signposted by the use of thickened and coloured initials.

P3 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 1917³³⁶

s.xii; Augustine and Hugh; 107ff.; 335 x 232mm (240 x 160mm); 2 columns of 42 lines; painted red, blue or green initials; polychrome rubrication; marginal notes in lighter ink.

The manuscript contains only two texts, Augustine’s *Confessions* (preceded by the passage of the *Retractationes* pertaining to this work) and Hugh’s commentary^(75^{va}-107^{vb}). The latter begins on the verso of the folio where the former ends

³³⁶ BN, II, p.237.

(the *Confessions* completed on folio 75^{ra} and the commentary opening on folio 75^{va}). This points to the manuscript being unitary. Nevertheless, the two works do not share a scribe.

In the title they give to the work, P3 shares ^{with P2} the words 'tractatus' and 'Parisiensis'. However, a more interesting parallel is to be found in the rubric of P3: 'Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis Parisiensis super Lamentationes Ieremie non tamen continuus.' The words 'non tamen continuus' could be an independent observation or an abridgement of the marginal note of P2 cited above. In any case, it is a phrase which serves to link a number of manuscripts, as we shall see.

The only noteworthy difference between P3 and P2 is the former's inclusion of lemmata marks in the margin. In all other respects, the manuscripts closely conform with one another. The division of the commentary is the same, they both lack sense headings, they both include large coloured initials in the same places, and they share numerous variants.

L1 London, British Library, Add. 19985³³⁷

s.xii/xiii; Hugh and Augustine; 190ff.; 184 x 125mm (158 x 92mm); single column of 31/32 lines; composite; red and green initials until f.80^v; from f.81r, only red initials.

Augustine's *Enchiridion de fide, spe et caritate* is sandwiched between two major works by Hugh. The former is incomplete, breaking off in mid-sentence at the bottom of folio 80^v.³³⁸ The opening text is given the following rubric:

f.1^r *De archa Noe pro archa sapientie cum archa Ecclesie et archa matris gratie liber incipit*

Both this text and the *Enchiridion* were probably transcribed in the twelfth century.

³³⁷ *A Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Library in the years 1854-1860* (London, 1965), p.14.

³³⁸ This copy is thus interrupted at *Enchiridion de fide, spe et caritate*, 27. 39.

The third and final work is *Super Lamentationes*,³³⁹ copied probably in the thirteenth century, entitled as follows:

f.81^r *Incipit quedam pars expositionis Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie prophete*

Such a title indicates that a scribe noticed the incomplete nature of the commentary and assumed it was due to later choice or accident.

O2 Oxford, New College, 144³³⁹

s.xiii/s.xiv;³⁴⁰ collection of works by Hugh (end missing); paper; 256ff.; 300 x 195mm (216 x 130mm); single column of 33 lines; elaborately decorated polychrome initials (gold, blue and red); red and blue initials throughout; rubrication and coloured running titles.

This *de luxe* copy is devoted to works by or attributed to Hugh:

f.1^r *Incipit liber Hugonis de Sancto Victoris de archa Noe pro archa sapientie cum archa Ecclesie et archa matris gratie*

f.38^v *Incipit libellus de f<orma>tione arche*

f.56^r *Incipit quarta decima pars in libro de sacramentis. De confessione*

f.71^v *Quinta decima pars. De unctione infirmorum capitulum primum*

f.73^r *Incipit tractatus de conscientia secundum Hugonem de Sancto Victore*

f.88^r *Incipit Hugo de Sancto Victore de informatione, conversatione et instru<c>tione <monachorum?> (= De institutione nouitiorum)*

f.102^v *Incipit Hugo de forma et modo orandi et de uirtute orationis et uarietate affectus (= De uirtute orandi)*

f.112^r *Incipit prologus in Didascalicon*

(f.113^r *Liber primus de origine artium*)

³³⁹ H. O. Coxe, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum qui in collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adseruatur* (Oxford, 1952), I.3, pp.53-4.

³⁴⁰ The catalogue mistakenly dates O2 to the twelfth century. But the script suggests it was made no earlier (and probably later) than the late thirteenth century.

- f.150^v *Incipit Hugo super Lamentationes Ieremie*
- f.183^v *Incipit Hugo de conuersione claustrum* (= Book 2 of the *De claustrum anime* by Hugh of Fouillois)
- f.203^v *Incipit de claustrum anime* (= Book 3 of *De claustrum anime*)
- f.212^v *Incipit Hugo de institutione nouitiorum*
- f.226^r *Incipit Hugo de arrha anime*
- f.231^v *Incipit dialogus eiusdem de sacramentis legis*
- f.244^v *Incipit Hugo de oratione*
- f.250^r *Incipit prologus in <tractatus> de laude caritatis*
- f.254^r *Sermo: 'Ibo mihi ad montem myrrhe'* (= *Eulogium sponsi et sponse*)
- f.259^r *Incipit epithalamium super illud 'Tota pulchra es'* (= *De assumptione beate Marie*)
- f.263^v *Incipit de contemplatione uisionis in monte* (end missing)

It is by far the latest extant collection of this kind. Like the thirteenth-century manuscript from Cluny, it has running titles throughout, for example, 'Hugo super Lamentationes Ieremie' for *Super Lamentationes*. *O2* and *V* share six texts apart from this commentary, two of which are unique to them alone in the Σ group. Like *Ma*, it contains Hugh of Fouillois's praise of cloistered life, *De claustrum anime*. Unlike *Ma*, it only has part of this work and wrongly ascribes it to Hugh. Strangely, *O2* has duplicate copies of *De institutione nouitiorum* and *De uirtute orationis*, though with different rubrics.

O2 does not include *Super Lamentationes* in its entirety, but rather an abridgement with gaps; there is, however, no word revision. Of all the epitomes of this work, it is the least abridged.

Like *L1*, the exposition is clearly divided into sections. Thus, red sense headings highlighted by blue 'capitula' signs are added within the text-block. Moreover, the initials at the start of a new sense or verse are coloured blue and framed by a red square border. Unlike any other manuscript in this subgroup, lemmata are often distinguished from exposition by their larger size. They are also preceded by blue 'capitula' signs. The overall effect is both ornate and convenient.

Ca2 Cambridge, University Library, Ee. VI. 27³⁴¹

s.xv; Peter of Blois, Hugh, anonymous commentary on Isaiah; 84ff.; 190 x 130mm (140 x 106mm); blue and red initials.

The title given to *Super Lamentationes* is as follows:

f.21^r *Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis Parisiacensis super Lamentationes Ieremie prophete non tamen continu>s*

Ca2 presents the commentary with clear divisions. Large coloured initials distinguish key sections (e.g. the prologue to Lamentations 2 and the opening ‘Q’ of the actual exposition of this chapter). Sense headings are added within the text block, sometimes introduced by a red paragraph mark.

³⁴¹ A *Catalogue of the Manuscripts preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, (Hildesheim and New York, 1980, reprint), II, p.266-7. I am grateful to Willis Johnson for informing me of the existence of this witness and for drawing my attention to the fact that it contains a complete text of *Super Lamentationes* (the catalogue is mistaken about where it starts in the manuscript and therefore describes it as missing its beginning). He pointed out an addition to the end of the commentary (before the explicit). It begins ‘Nullus sibi unquam presumat accusator’ and ends ‘accusator intestinus querendus est, non suspectus’. I have not been able to identify it.

Manuscripts of the Σ group which are particular cases

Va1 Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica, Ross. 227³⁴²

s.xii; Lamentations commentary; 65ff.; 227 x 152mm (164 x 90mm).

There would appear to be a record of donation or *ex libris* on folio 10^v which is indecipherable. The commentary is followed by some short extracts: a gradual chant for Palm Sunday, then a fragment on administering the last rites from Augustine's *De penitentia*, and finally an excerpt from a letter by Bernard which begins 'Venerabili fratri et ** abbati suo Bru. (Bruno?) et fratri Angelo, totique Careuall(is) conuentui frater Bernardus Clareuallensis uocatus abbas salutem'. This final passage offers us clues to the manuscript's provenance and origin. 'Carevallis' was the Cistercian monastery of Chiaravalle near Milan.

The manuscript is composed of fine parchment. The text-block leaves plenty of space in the outer margin (45mm). However, discoloration at the beginning and end of the manuscript suggest that it was unbound for some time. It was possible that the first folio, which is blank apart for some notes, served as a parchment cover. *Super Lamentationes* begins on folio 2^r.

On f.1^v, Jerome's preface to Lamentations is written in the top corner in a twelfth-century hand. Below it, in thirteenth-century script, is the following remark: 'Notandum quod Sacra Scriptura quatuor modis exponitur, scilicet historice, allegorice, tropologice et anagogice.'

³⁴² Unpublished catalogue: See F. E. Cranz (ed.), *A Microfilm Corpus of Unpublished Inventories of Latin Manuscripts through 1600 AD*, I, p.146, no. 313.

L2 London, British Library, Royal 5. E. XIV³⁴³

s.xiii; Anselm, Pseudo-Leo, Hugh and Bernard; 190ff.; 230 x 155mm; 2 columns of 50 lines; composite: list of contents on folio 180^v which opens 'Hec sunt contenta in precedenti uolumine per ordinem quorum tituli hic sunt scripti'.

The first volume is largely devoted to works by Anselm. *Super Lamentationes* is the only text by Hugh in this section. However, in the second volume of the manuscript there are two of his works:

f.182^{ra} *Incipit prologus in tractatum Domini Hugonis prioris de institutione nouitiorum...Explicit prologus. Incipit liber Hugonis de disciplina et uita clericorum*

f.188^{rb} *De uirtute orandi*

The title for *Super Lamentationes* is identical to that of *L1*:

f.36^{ra} *Quedam pars expositionis Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie*

Not surprisingly, these two manuscripts share certain variants.³⁴⁴ *L2* has a similar presentation of the commentary: within the text-block there are sense headings or space left for them to be added later. Sometimes, they are added in the margin instead. Gaps for *litterae notabiliores* are left at key points, such as the opening of the prologue to Lamentations 2.

L2 is an individual case because, although it shares some errors with the manuscripts of the Σ group as a whole and the Σ^2 subgroup in particular, it is on a number of occasions right where these are wrong, as will be clear from the enumeration of variants that follows.

³⁴³ G. F. Warner and J. P. Gilson, *British Library: Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the old Royal and King's Collections* (London, 1921), pp.116-17.

³⁴⁴ See below pp.133-4.

Shared Variants of Σ ³⁴⁵

1. Omissions. Only a few are clear errors, for example:

i. finite verb:

Quando uero per infidelitatem eos excecari permisit, et a spe promissionis et hereditatis sue alienos **fecit**, quasi munitiones eius dissipauit. (274C)

fecit] *om.* Σ (^{Ca2}~~excepto~~ L1 L2)³⁴⁶

ii. *saut du même au même* confined to this group:

Quod tamen quoniam non ex ira, sed ex misericordia operatur, **non inimicus et hostis, sed ‘quasi inimicus’ et ‘quasi hostis’ dicitur.** (272D)

non inimicus et / sed quasi hostis Σ ³⁴⁷ (*excepto* L2)

iii. Omissions impairing style rather than sense, for example:

a. Sed fit nonnunquam ut dum homo illicitis **carnis sue** desideriis resistere et motus sensuum suorum custodire negligit, ita tandem praua consuetudine illigetur...(258C)

carnis sue] *om.* Σ (*excepto* L2)

³⁴⁵ *E* originally belonged to another group, but was later contaminated by the Σ^2 version. Where this latter set are wrong, *E* sometimes preserves the correct reading. At other times it changes this to the error of Σ^2 . I signal this by the abbreviation for *post correctionem*. Otherwise, *E* does not share the variant.

³⁴⁶ See below p.134.

³⁴⁷ For the alternative conjunctions, see the critical apparatus.

Although the omitted words are not essential to our understanding of the sentence, they do provide a balanced complement for the words ‘sensuum suorum’ in the second infinitive phrase.

b. ...non ut paruuli **in domo patris**, sed quasi quidam populus in ciuitate sub lege imperatoris sui uiuere debent. (259A)

in domo patris] *om.* Σ (*p.c. E*)

The omission undermines the comparison between the discipline of the household and that of the city. In any case, just a few lines above, Hugh used the phrase ‘paruuli quidam in domo patris’.

c. Videte quam magna ruina: de paradiso in hunc mundum, de hoc mundo in infernum **homo corruit**. (271A)

homo corruit] *om.* Σ , homo a.c. *V* (*excepto L2*)

2. Wording. Omissions constitute the predominant links between the manuscripts in the Σ group. However, there are three examples of shared variants, of which the first is the only clear error:

a. *In opprobrium et indignationem furoris sui regem et sacerdotem*, subauditur ‘tradidit’. His duabus personis regebatur populus ille, **regali** scilicet et sacerdotali. (275D)

regali] *legali* Σ

b.

Vnde sequitur: *Cum exhalarent animas suas in sinu matrum suarum*. Quid namque est sinus matrum nisi blanda adulatio prelatorum? Quasi morientes namque filios matres in sinu tenent, quando carnalium mentes in **torpore** suo pereuntes mali prelati non solum ad bonam operationem non exsuscitant, sed

etiam blandis fauoribus palpando in sua perditione fouent.
(290C)

torpore] corpore Σ

c. Electi uero in bonis actibus suis tanto amplius manifestari refugiunt, quanto magis eterne retributionis premium ex **admixture** terrene laudis imminui sibi pertimescunt. (299C)

admixture] admiratione Σ

Shared variants of Σ^1

A few minor errors link these three manuscripts, for example:

i. Et **est** admirantis uel dolentis uox ista. (255D)

est] *om.* Σ^1

ii. Commemoratio (257B)] Comeratio Σ^1

iii. Qui sunt prophete peccatricis anime, qui falsa et stulta **ei** uident, nisi... (294D)

ei] eis Σ^1

iv. Sed cum naturalia desideria in **illecebrosos** appetitus et terrenos affectus degenerauerunt,...(271C)

illecebrosos] illecebrosas Σ^1 (*a.c. Ma*)

Shared Variants of Σ^2

This subgroup is characterized by many shared errors.

1. Word-order. The most common type relates to word-order, for example:

i. ...animam que 'sola sedet' quando a Deo derelinquitur; plena autem populo uirtutum, quando **a Deo inhabitatur**. (258A)

a Deo inhabitatur] inhabitatur a Deo Σ^2

ii. Exprimit autem **hic affectum fluctuantium**... (262A)

hic affectum fluctuantium] affectum fluctuantium hic Σ^2

2. Errors in wording. There are more or less obvious errors of copying, for example:

i. Nunc autem 'tributaria', quia **uitiis** subiecta seruit. (259B)

uitiis] intus Σ^2 (*excepto L2*)

ii.

Vacce igitur quasi arcam superimpositam **gestantes**, pergentes et mugientes, recto itinere Bethsamis **uadunt**, quando fideles legis diuine meditationem iugiter in corde suo portantes per uiam boni operis ad celestem patriam tendunt et pergentes pro his quos adhuc carnalis affectus in hoc mundo obligat mugitus compassionis edunt... (299A - B)

gestantes] portantes Σ^2

uadunt] pergunt Σ^2

iii. ...ut tanto amplius etiam in semetipsis ad bona agenda reddantur tepidi, quanto magis sunt in compassione fraterne **tribulationis** afflicti. (286B)

tribulationis] dilectionis Σ^2

iv. ...ita quisque sensuum diuersos habet motus, et diuersas operationes, per quas foris in uisibilibus **diffunditur**. (258B)

diffunditur] diuiditur Σ^2 (*p.c. E*)

v. Hoc est quod monuit 'prepara cor tuum ad temptationes', ut in uia Dei ambulantes ad toleranda **aduersa** parati simus, qui, priusquam in uia Dei essemus, illicita nos perpetrasse meminimus. (263B)

aduersa] uniuersa Σ^2 , ad uniuersa *O2*

P2 and *P3* are in fact more corrupt than the later extant witnesses in this subgroup. They share some peculiar errors which point to a close relationship between these manuscripts, for example:

1. Word order.

i. Quomodo bonum illum **habitatores** **perdidit**... (258B)

habitatores perdidit] perdidit habitatores *P2 + P3*

ii. *Ubi est thesaurus tuus, ibi est cor tuum.* Ubi est amor tuus, **ibi est animus tuus**. (290D)

ibi est animus tuus] animus tuus ibi est *P2 + P3*

2. Omissions

Quid ergo sunt porte **erecte** nisi doctores celestia predicantes. ...Et que sunt porte destructe et ablate, nisi...(281A)

erecte] *om.* *P2 + P3*

P3 has more mistakes than *P2*, as well as very idiosyncratic orthography.³⁴⁸ However, there is one instance where *P3* is right against *P2*:

Dicatur ergo: 'Luxit antemurale et murus pariter dissipatus est', quia inde omnis priorum **Patrum** multitudo doluit quod...(279A)

Patrum] *om.* *P2*

The later manuscripts *L1*, *L2*, *O2* and *Ca2* have variants which connect them with one another, of which only the first is a clear error:

i. Cur enim nisi quia Deum offenderunt? 'Solam' autem dicit, hoc est desolatam propter populum abductum, captiuatum in Babilonem. (256D)

abductum] adductum *L1 + L2*³⁴⁹

ii. Si ergo anima suo inferiori, hoc est sensualitati principari desiderat, necesse est ut suo superiori, hoc est Deo se subiciat, quia nequaquam subtus se a suo inferiori turbari poterit, dum supra se **Deum rectorem** habebit. (258C)

Deum rectorem] Deum suum rectorem *Ca2 L1 L2 O2*

³⁴⁸ Examples of such orthography are the omission of letters: 'aumentum', 'ecluditur'; the separation of prefixes from their root-word: 'ad mixto', 'ad optati', 'in culcatio', 'in stabili', 'peruersis'; the inversion of letters: 'paruos' for 'prauos', 'palguntur' for 'planguntur'.

³⁴⁹ I have not checked whether *Ca2* and *O2* share this error.

iii. Intus et non extra derelictus fuit Daud, cuius mentem intus sibi libido per consensum subdidit, sed **prophetica foris admonitio** ad penitentiam reuocauit. (261A)

prophetica foris admonitio] prophetica admonitio foris *Ca2 L1 L2 O2*

iv. Bene ergo postquam senes in terra sedent, et tacent uirgines capita sua cinere conspergunt, quia simplices quique in Ecclesia cum prelatos suos **postposito studio predicationis** terrenis delectationibus uident incumbere, etiam in bonis que agunt carnaliter delectari incipiunt. (284D)

postposito studio predicationis] postposito predicationis studio *Ca2 L1 L2 O2*

v. Quando uero per infidelitatem eos excecari permisit, et a spe promissionis et hereditatis sue alienos **fecit**, quasi munitiones eius dissipauit. (274C)

alienos fecit] alienos effecit *Ca2*, alienauit *L1 L2*³⁵⁰

These are most probably a correction of the reading of other Σ manuscripts which omit the verb 'fecit'.³⁵¹

Such shared readings point to ~~two~~ four manuscripts which are housed in England being connected.

P2, P3 and Va1

The two French witnesses *P2* and *P3* are related to another continental manuscript, *Va1*, which probably comes from Northern Italy. The latter does not share the majority of the corruptions of Σ^2 , but does share a few errors with *P2*

³⁵⁰ This reading also comes in one of the passages *O2*, in abridging the text, cuts out.

³⁵¹ See above p.128.

and *P3* which link it with this subgroup. The most notable instance of this is its title, which, despite different word order, is identical to that of *P3*:

Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis non tamen continuus super Lamentationes Ieremie Prophete.

The following two errors further suggest that *Val* is related to *P2* and *P3*:

i. *Luxit antemurale et murus pariter dissipatus sit...* Quod autem dixit ‘pariter’ sic accipi potest: uel quod murus pariter cum antemurali **luxerit**...(279B)

luxerit] dixerit *P2 P3 Val*

ii. Intus et non extra derelictus fuit Daud, cuius mentem intus sibi libido per consensum subdidit, sed prophetica **foris** admonitio ad penitentiam reuocauit. (261A)

foris] *om. P2 + P3 + Val*

However, *Val* also has a notable feature in common with *V*, discussed below.³⁵²

General remarks on the Σ group

The errors which clearly identify all these manuscripts as descending from the common ancestor are minor and few in number. The archetype Σ represents a reliable text of *Super Lamentationes*. In certain places where there are small omissions, it requires supplementations from the other groups. It is worth bearing in mind that this is the version reproduced by the Victorine witness. Hugh’s own institution would presumably have owned copies which derived from his own compositions. Moreover, the subgroup to which *V* belongs has few mistakes of any note.

³⁵² See below p.252.

The 1648 Rouen edition of *Super Lamentationes*, which is the version reprinted in the *Patrologia*, derives from this group. The Victorines were responsible for the former publication, and it is highly plausible that they used a manuscript from the St Victor library which was either *V* itself or a relation of *V*. However, this published version includes several striking idiosyncracies not shared by the Σ group or any other manuscripts.

The subgroup Σ^2 contains several corruptions that bear witness to a certain carelessness in copying in their archetype. Despite the corruptions, it is nonetheless a subgroup which derives ultimately from a reliable source. In fact on two occasions, it is alone in bearing a correct reading.³⁵³

³⁵³ See below p.257.

ii. Δ Group

s.xii

Eton, College Library, 38, <i>ante correctionem</i> (Gloucester region)	E
Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 212 (St Lambrecht, Benedictine)	G
Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.II.8 (St Peter's, Gloucester, Benedictine)	H

s.xii/xiii

Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College 71, (Wardon, Bedfordshire, Cistercian)	Ca1
--	-----

s.xiii

Worcester, Chapter Library, Ch. 48	W
Vatican Library, Ottob., lat. 103	Va2

s.xv

Innsbruck, Universitätsbibliothek, 98	I
Oxford, Merton College, 49	M
Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1602	Vi

The extant witnesses come from England and Austria. The text of this group was circulating in Southern Austria at the same time as the twelfth-century witnesses from the West of England. *G* has a particular relationship with two other English manuscripts, *Ca*¹ and *Va2*. Although these postdate *G*, there are reasons for assuming that this manuscript descended from an archetype which originated in England. Six of the nine members of this group are English manuscripts. Apart

from *G*, there are two other Austrian witnesses, both dating from the fifteenth century and related to *G*.

This group includes early witnesses in the text's history, which date from the mid-twelfth century. It shares at least three minor variants with the Σ group (but none of those enumerated above).³⁵⁴ The appearance of two early witnesses in the Gloucester area is most readily explained by Andrew of St Victor's contacts with the daughter-house at Wigmore.³⁵⁵ The most likely conclusion, therefore, would be that the Δ group derives from a Victorine archetype, but one that did not share the significant omissions of *V*.

Δ^1 Subgroup

s.xii

Eton, College Library, 38, <i>ante correctionem</i> (Gloucester region)	E
Hereford, Cathedral Library, O.II.8 (St Peter's, Gloucester, Benedictine)	H

s.xiii

Worcester, Chapter Library, Ch. 48	W
------------------------------------	---

These three manuscripts are localized to the Gloucester region. They share many omissions and errors, and can therefore be considered closely related. The majority of these mistakes are corrected in *E*, where, for example, omissions are added in the margin or corrections written over erasures. There is no doubt that *E* was subsequently corrected with reference to another copy of the work. As

³⁵⁴ On the relationship between groups, see below, p.249.

³⁵⁵ See discussion below pp.260-1.

mentioned above, it has in fact undergone contamination from Group Σ and, in particular, subgroup Σ^2 .

H Hereford, Cathedral Library, O. II. 8³⁵⁶

s.xii; St Peter's, Gloucester, Benedictine; various twelfth-century works: Hugh, Drogo (cardinal-bishop of Ostia), Richard, Bernard (doubtful ascription) and Robert Pullen; 214ff. (ii + 212); 270 x 185mm (200 x 140mm); 2 columns of 35-36 lines (to f.65^v), 30-37 lines (from f.66^r); four hands: 'expert English protogothic bookhands, the first occasionally interrupted by the others';³⁵⁷ coloured initials (red and green used by the first hand, which belongs to the scribe of the Lamentations commentary).³⁵⁸

Mynors is able to place and date this manuscript through palaeographical features. He locates its provenance by identifying the hand of 'nota' marks as belonging to a scribe of St Peters. According to the same authority, it was copied in the middle of the twelfth century. The presence of the *Beniamin minor* by Richard may, however, be proof that this manuscript was copied somewhat later than the mid-twelfth century. I do not know when Richard is thought to have composed it, but his date of death is accepted as being 1173. The other works in the manuscript were probably written before 1150, for Robert Pullen died in about 1146 and Drogo in 1137.

It contains the following works of Hugh and Richard:

f.1^r-33^v *Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie non tamen continuus*

f.40^r-65^v *Beniamin minor* (Richard)

f.133^v-212^r *Incipit prefatio Magistri Hugonis Parisiacensis in expositione Ecclesiaste*

³⁵⁶ R. A. B. Mynors and R. M. Thomson, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Hereford Cathedral Library* (Hereford, 1993), pp.14-15.

³⁵⁷ Ibid.

³⁵⁸ Ibid.

Thus, it includes Hugh's two major biblical commentaries. *Super Lamentationes* is the first text in the manuscript, *In Ecclesiasten* the last. It does not include other works of line-by-line exegesis. In fact, most of the other accompanying texts are sermons (four doubtfully ascribed to Bernard and one by Robert Pullen).

The rubric 'Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie non tamen continuus' occurs in *P3*. In *H* it is written in tiny letters at the top edge of the folio, serving as a note for a rubricator. However, the actual rubric placed at the start of the text is mistaken: 'Incipiunt Lamentationes Ieremie.' Not only does it fail to conform to the prescribed rubric given at the top of the folio, but it does not precede a copy of the biblical text of Lamentations, but rather Hugh's commentary.

The text is not divided up into sections. The prologue to Lamentations 2 is simply a continuation of what precedes, with no enlarged initial for the 'M' of 'Medicus'. There is no *littera notabilior* to distinguish either the literal interpretation of 2:1 or the allegorical reading of this verse. Furthermore, at the change of subject-matter in the allegorical exposition of 2:5 (where Hugh writes, 'Ad populum etiam Iudaicum hoc specialiter referri potest'), *H* does not even start a new sentence (the 'a' of 'Ad' is mistakenly put into the lower case).

However, the text is divided according to its senses by means of headings in the margins, capitula signs and large initials, though not consistently. Sometimes the opening word of a lemma is copied in capitals.

There are also marginalia written in the twelfth century, which serve as evidence that the commentary was used. A later reader was clearly interested in numbered items, for he writes notes such as 'Quattuor modis Christum comedimus' at 289C and 'Due ciuitates' at 290A.

E Eton, College Library, 38³⁵⁹

s.xii; Gloucester region; various twelfth-century texts, and works falsely attributed to Church Fathers: Bernard, Robert Pullen, Hugh, Augustine (spurious attribution), Leo (spurious attribution); 215ff.; 285 x 193mm (225 x 140mm); 2 columns of 38 lines; coloured initials (i. 'green patterned in white with red and green ornament; ii. 3-line or 2-line, red, green or blue, often with a line of white');³⁶⁰ 'Pledged at Oxford in 1460 by Robert Selby...At Eton by 1500'.³⁶¹

Ker dates the script to the mid-twelfth century. He believes this script has features which locate *E* to the Gloucester region. Further evidence that *E* comes from this area may be provided by the presence of sermons by Robert Pullen. (*H* also contains a sermon by this theologian, but not one of those found in *E*). Robert Pullen taught theology at Oxford between 1133 and 1138.³⁶² One of his students was Gilbert Foliot (c.1110-87), who became abbot of Gloucester (from 1139-1148), then bishop of Hereford (from 1148-1163), before being appointed bishop of London.³⁶³ His presence in this region may have prompted copying of works of his former master, but this is highly speculative.

As in the case of *H*, the context is one of homiletic literature. *E* has numerous sermons, eighty-four of which are ascribed to Bernard and seven to Robert Pullen. It includes two works by Hugh:

f.151^v *Magister Hugo* (= extract from *In Ecclesiasten*, Homily 16, PL 175, cols 229-30)

f.168^r-203^v *Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis Parisiacensis super Lamentationes Ieremie non tamen continue*

³⁵⁹ M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Library of Eton College* (Cambridge, 1895), p.120; N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries* (Oxford, 1977), II, pp.666-72.

³⁶⁰ Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts*, p.671

³⁶¹ Ibid.

³⁶² Thereafter he was a master at Sainte-Geneviève in Paris until his death in about 1146. See R. W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe*, (Oxford, 1995), I, pp.176-7.

³⁶³ ODCC, p.621. A work of his written after 1163 is contained in the later member of this subgroup, W from Worcester Cathedral Library.

The short extract from *Ecclesiastes* supports a connection with *H*, which contains the whole text. The title of *Super Lamentationes* is almost identical with that of *H* (and of course *P3*), except that in place of the adjective ‘continuus’ there is the adverb ‘continue’. This is the main rubric for the text in *E*. It does not share the strange ‘Incipiunt Lamentationes Ieremie’ of *H*.

E and *H* have another text in common, namely, an extract from the *Meditatio in Passionem* of Drogo, cardinal-bishop of Ostia. There is no title for it in *H*, unlike *E* which has the following: *Quod nusquam inueniatur Dominus nisi in Cruce, id est fide, caritate, spe et timore.*³⁶⁴

E shares the lack of divisions that we find in *H* (including the copying of ‘Ad populum etiam Iudaicum’ etc. as though it were the continuation of the sentence). It has a corresponding use of headings and large initials to mark changes of sense.

I have already referred to the fact that *E* has undergone subsequent contamination from a manuscript of the Σ group. The numerous cases where its text is emended in the margin and in the text block itself confirms this, since these corrections occur where *H* has an error. This emendation extends on occasion even to ‘striking out’ words which are missing from the Σ witnesses, as in the following example:³⁶⁵

...non ut paruuli **in domo patris**, sed quasi quidam populus in ciuitate sub lege imperatoris sui uiuere debent. (259A)

in domo patris] *om.* Σ (*p.c.* *E*)

However, *E* tends to avoid changing its original text where it is correct. Instead, it sometimes adds the alternative reading in the margin with a *renvoi* mark, which accompanies the following examples:

³⁶⁴ f.203^v. It begins, ‘Circumire possum. Domine, celum et terram’, and is contained in another manuscript which provides a clue to the twelfth-century diffusion of Hugh in West England. See below footnote 515.

³⁶⁵ Cited above p.129.

i. Nunc autem regnum totum cum principibus suis polluitur, quia populus cum protectoribus suis gentibus **subigitur**. (266A)

subigitur Δ^1] uel subiugatur *add. in marg. E*

ii. Non fuit in die furoris Domini qui effugeret et relinqueretur. Quia cum mortis hora superuenerit, tunc quisque ad conscientiam suam redire compellitur, ut ipsa comitante ad excipiendam **sententiam** iudicis sine dilatione ab hac uita transferatur. (322A)

sententiam] iustitiam *P2 + P3*,³⁶⁶ uel iustitiam *add. in marg. E*

As we shall see, the original version contained in *E*, namely that of the Δ^1 witnesses, was poor. It is perhaps not surprising, then, that someone felt a need to emend the original text of *E*. What is interesting is that they did so by collating it with a version of *Super Lamentationes* found in another manuscript.

W Worcester, Chapter Library, Ch. 48³⁶⁷

s.xiii; various twelfth-century works: Hugh, Drogo, Gilbert Foliot, Hugh of Fouilloy; 101ff.; probably small;³⁶⁸ single column of 25 lines; unitary up to f. 70^r.

The script indicates a dating from the early thirteenth century. There is a thirteenth-century *ex libris* on the verso of the flyleaf at the beginning of the manuscript: 'Liber beate Marie Wygornensis.' An exposition of the Lord's Prayer contained in it is addressed to Walter, archdeacon of Hereford, by the above-mentioned Gilbert Foliot, himself a Church dignitary of that very centre from

³⁶⁶ I have as yet to check whether this reading is shared by all the witnesses of Σ^2 or just *P2*, *P3* and the exemplar which contaminated *E*.

³⁶⁷ K. J. Floyer, *Catalogue of Manuscripts preserved in the Chapter Library of Worcester Cathedral* (Oxford, 1906), pp.131-32.

³⁶⁸ I have only seen a microfilm of *W* and the catalogue for Worcester Cathedral Library does not give measurements; I assume it is small given that it is a single column of 25 lines.

1139 to 1163. It also shares with *E* and *H* a sermon by Drogo. It is no surprise, therefore, to find that it is textually close to the manuscripts of this area.

The *ex libris* on the flyleaf is followed by a list of contents in the same hand.

Super Lamentationes is the first text in the manuscript (as in *H*). It bears the following rubric:

f.1^r *Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie non tamen continuus*

The title for this commentary in *W* is identical to that of *H*. It is worth noting the presence again of Hugh of Fouilloy's *De clauastro anime* (or part of it) which we have already found copied with *Super Lamentationes* (and other of Hugh's works) in *Ma* and *O2* above. Here, as in *O2*, it ^{might be} wrongly attributed to Hugh.³⁶⁹

³⁶⁹ See discussion below, p. 124.

Δ² Subgroup

s.xii

Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 212 (St Lambrecht, Benedictine) G

s.xii/s.xiii

Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, 71 (Wardon,
Bedfordshire, Cistercian) Ca1
Vatican Library, Ottob. lat. 103 Va2

s.xv

Innsbruck, Universitätsbibliothek, 98 I
Oxford, Merton College, 49 O4
Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 1602 Vi

G Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 212³⁷⁰

s.xii; St Lambrecht, Benedictine; Honorius Augustodunensis and Hugh; 160ff.; 250 x 170mm (200 x 120mm); 25-26 lines; coloured initials.

This manuscript is probably composite. No scribe is shared by both works. *Super Lamentationes* begins on a new quire (f.120^r). The large ornate decorated initials used in Honorius Augustodunensis' *Commentary on the Song of Songs* to mark the start of each book differ from that used at the opening of Hugh's exposition.³⁷¹ It is not only the decoration which distinguishes the two works, but

³⁷⁰ A. Kern, *Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek in Graz* (Leipzig, 1942). I, p.107.

³⁷¹ In the former, initials are six to seven lines long, drawn in red, decorated with blue and green (and, on one occasion, with yellow as well). There are leaf and clasp decorations. In the latter, the 'Q' of 'Quomodo' is seven lines long, but differs from previous illustrated initials. It is decorated with an animal; the 'Q' is more rounded; brown is employed; there is a greater use of red as a filler; there are different shapes for the leaves; the letter is traced with black ink; it has an outer box with a border of yellow, red and green.

also the use of rubrication. Red is often applied throughout the commentary on the Song of Songs to signal new sections and lemmatization, but is only rarely used in *Super Lamentationes*, though initials are touched up with red up to f.124^r to signal certain divisions.

There is an *ex libris* in the margin of folio 1^r (which is where the *Commentary on the Song of Songs* begins): ‘Sigillum Sancte Marie. Hic autem liber in festo Sancte Marie legitur, quia ipsa gessit typum Ecclesie que uirgo est et mari<td>a.’³⁷²

The palaeographical evidence points to a mid-twelfth-century composition of *Super Lamentationes*. But this would need to be confirmed in the light of developments in protogothic in this region.

Like the Victorine manuscript V, G has no title as such for *Super Lamentationes*. However, the two opening words ‘Quomodo sedet’ are written in the large upper case letters. It is possible that this was taken as the title, in the absence of one in G’s exemplar. As already mentioned, the initial ‘Q’ is elaborately decorated.

Sense headings are generally not used. The exceptions are before the moral interpretation of 1:3, where the word ‘Moral’ occurs in the text, and at two places later on in the text, which we shall discuss in due course. For the changes of sense in the exposition of Lamentations 1:1-2, large red initials are used. Thereafter, in the section on Lamentations 1, at certain points initials of a smaller size are struck through with a red line, as though for a subsequent rubricator. These initials are not confined to sense or verse changes, often simply marking the beginning of sentences. They do not occur in the commentary on Lamentations 2 except at one place which is certainly not a juncture: ‘Senes ergo filie Sion prelati Ecclesie...’ (283C). Nevertheless, thickened initials are used in this part on Lamentations 2, to distinguish lemmata; an exception occurs in the prologue, where no such initial is used for the ‘M’ of ‘Medicus’.³⁷³ Moreover, at three points these initials are preceded by a paragraph sign, notably before the start of the allegorical section on 2:1ff. before 2:4 and before the moral interpretation of

³⁷² The final word of this *ex libris* looks like ‘Maria’.

³⁷³ Compare this with Δ¹.

2:6, next to which in the margin is the sense heading 'MOR'. This tag is also placed in the margin next to the mystical interpretation of 2:1, evidence that a reader or scribe judged the discussion of original sin to be a tropological rather than an allegorical concern.

Vi Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, 1602³⁷⁴

s.xv; miscellaneous works: Richard, Hugh, Albertus Magnus, Aegidius, Bonaventure, Bernard, William of St Thierry; 156ff.; composite; 224 x 145mm (175 x 112mm; f.66r-75v, 181 x 119mm; then, 187 x 119mm); 2 columns of 38-41 lines (f.38r, 34 lines; f.66r-75v, single text block of 45 lines); red initials and paragraph marks.

The manuscript contains some abridgements. In particular, *Super Lamentationes* is heavily abridged, fitting into barely ten folios (ff.31^{vb}-39^{vb}). It is given the rubric 'Super Threnos' and begins: 'Quomodo sedet sola ciuitas plena populo. Moraliter. Ciuitas significat animam que sola sedet' (258A), and ends 'illa die peribunt etc.' (322B). Only the mystical and moral interpretations are excerpted.

The commentary is preceded by Richard on Apocalypse: 'Excerpta de Richardo super Apokalipsim' (f.1^r). Another work by Hugh, his *De arrha anime*, is included later on: 'Incipit Soliloquium de arra anime quod quidam dicunt quod Hugo, quidam quod Beatus Augustinus fecerit' (ff.123^{ra}-125^r). This was Hugh's most widely diffused work, so it is surprising that it should receive an unsure attribution.

In *Super Lamentationes*, lemmata are underlined in the same colour ink as text. There are many marginalia, of which a great part is almost illegible. Headings for the allegorical and moral senses occur here and there.

The work is followed by a fifteenth-century note, which points out that only the first two chapters are taken from the text of Lamentations. This note appears to be in the same hand as that of the text.

³⁷⁴ *Tabulae codicum manuscriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobensi asservatorum* (Vienna, 1864), I, p.259-60.

I Innsbruck, Universitätsbibliothek, 98³⁷⁵

s.xv (c.1460); Schnal, Carthusian; miscellaneous works: Gregory, Pseudo-Gregory, Pseudo-Bernard, Hugh, William of St Thierry; paper; 173ff.; 404 x 283mm (280/283 x 173/177); 2 columns; red rubrication and underlining.

I has a sixteenth-century *ex libris*: 'Liber domus Montis omnium Angelorum in Snals.' On folio 126^{ra}, there is a colophon for a scribe called Martin of Gundersdorf (=Guntramsdorf), 'monachus professus in Snals'.

This is another abridgement of the commentary. Although I have not consulted this manuscript, I think it highly likely that the abridgement is identical with that of *Vi*. Note, for example, the incipit and explicit: 'Quomodo sedet - Moraliter - Ciuitas significat animam...' (f.126^{va})... . 'in illa die peribunt omnes cogitationes eorum' (f.139^{ra}). *Vi* perhaps has precedence over *I*, for the former includes a title with no ascription, whereas the latter wrongly attributes the text to Gregory the Great: 'Incipit expositio Gregorii pape super Threnos...Explicit breuis expositio beati Gregorii super Threnos.' The last line in *I* and *V* is a citation by Hugh from Gregory.

I and *Vi* have a further connection in that they both contain the following work: *Epistola ad fratres de Monte Dei*, ascribed to Bernard, but actually by William of Saint Thierry.³⁷⁶ Interestingly, this work was also copied at St Lambrecht, the provenance of *G*.

³⁷⁵ W. Neuhauser, *Katalog der Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Innsbruck* (Vienna, 1987), I, pp.277-9.

³⁷⁶ See V. Honemann, *Die >Epistola ad fratres de Monte Dei< des Wilhelm von S-Thierry* (Zurich and Munich, 1978).

Ca1 Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, 71³⁷⁷

s.xii/xiii; Wardon, Bedfordshire, Cistercian; various texts: Ernardus, Cassiodorus, Rathrannus, Alexander III, Hugh; 149ff.; 265 x 160mm (175 x 98mm); single column of 30 lines; coloured initials.

There is a twelfth- or thirteenth-century *ex libris* on f.1^r: 'Liber Sancte Marie de Wardon.'

Super Lamentationes (ff.92^r- 138^r) is the final text to be copied with those which precede it. It is followed by two blank pages and then an unascribed work written in a much later hand in two columns, which is in fact a section of Hugh's *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris*.³⁷⁸ This is in turn followed by an extract from his *Notule super Genesim*.³⁷⁹

Hardly any sense headings are used. Large, coloured initials divide the text, distinguishing senses in the commentary on Lamentations 1, but thereafter for lemmata.

Va2 Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, Ottob. lat. 103³⁸⁰

s.xiii; Anselm, Bernard, Basil, Hugh; 84ff.; 335 x 240mm (275 x 185mm; f.70^r, 288 x 162mm); 2 columns of 59-64 lines; composite; coloured initials (red and blue; initial of *Super Lamentationes* blue and red with a darker red inside, more elaborate than earlier initials); red paragraph marks and underlining (brown underlining in the *Super Lamentationes*).

Va2 is mainly devoted to works by Anselm. There is a contents list on folio 68^v which does not mention Hugh's commentary. This in any case begins on folio 69^r. Moreover, it is the final text in Va2 and is preceded by a blank folio. Thus, the

³⁷⁷ M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Sidney Sussex College* (Cambridge, 1895), pp.50-1.

³⁷⁸ *De scripturis*, 1-17 (PL 175, 9A-24D).

³⁷⁹ *Notule super Pentateuch*, 3 (Ibid., 32C).

³⁸⁰ Unpublished catalogue: Kranz, *A Microfilm Corpus of Unpublished Inventories*, I, no. 310, p.145.

evidence indicates that *Super Lamentationes* was not part of a unitary collection, but was added later.

There are reasons for thinking this manuscript comes from England. On the flyleaves at the end there are various notes later in date, which, though largely indecipherable, do offer some clues to ownership:

Can(oni)co(s) fratres **Iohannis de Wy*oh*** exporta Ciste de **Alfred** a quinque s* die *alb* p*** p(ost) festum Sancte Lucie uirginis anno m ccc xl**. Et h(abe)t suplem *** * ex** du* cum se ***** quinque librorum de***** / in eodem uolumine coopertum albo corio in asse q*bus *.

The title given to *Super Lamentationes* is 'Incipit expositio Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie secundum triplicem intellectum, uidelicet historicum, allegoricum, moralem'.

A variety of devices are used to divide up the commentary. These are clear, but inconsistent. Paragraph signs and *litterae notabiliores* mark changes of sense and verse. Sometimes a capital is touched up in red, simply to mark the opening of a new sentence. Marginal sense headings occur occasionally in the margin.

O4 Oxford, Merton College 49³⁸¹

s.xv; various patristic and medieval works: Hugh, Richard, John Chrysostom, Augustine, Ambrose, Bede, Bonaventure; 354ff.; 210 x 138mm (160 x 95mm); single column of 44 lines; composite, though unitary up to the end of the last work by Hugh (f.313^v).

O4 contains a fifteenth-century copy of the *Indiculum* of Hugh's works as collected together by Gilduin.³⁸² It also has several works by Hugh and two by Richard:

f.1^r *Incipit liber primus Hugonis de Sancto Victoris de archa Noe.*

³⁸¹ Coxe, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum* (Oxford, 1852), I. 3, pp.33-4.

³⁸² See above p.105.

- f.33^v *De conscientia*
- f.43^v *Expositio Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie*
- f.73^r *Cum esset Iesus annorum duodecim* (= Misc. 1.81; followed by 2 letters)
- f.76^r *Expositio orationis dominice*
- f.81^r *Indiculum omnium scriptorum Magistri Hugonis de Sancto Victore
que scripsit*
- f.82^v *Responsio super quinque dubitationibus*
- f.83^r *De tribus locis filiorum Israel, Egypto, deserto et terra promissionis*
(= Misc. 1.95)
- f.83^v *De eo quod spiritualis diiudicat omnia, et de iudicio ueri et boni*
(= Misc. 1.1)
- f.86^v *De tribus uoluntatibus in Christo* (= Misc. 1.84)
- f.92^r (Richard) *De exterminatione mali et promotione boni*
- f.111^v (Richard) *De statu interioris hominis post lapsum*
-
- f.301^v *De sapientia Christi*
- f.306^v *De Beate Marie Virginis perpetua uirginitate*

Given the presence of the *Indiculum*, coupled with that of several short works shared by V, O4 is probably related to a Victorine exemplar.

Lemmata are underlined in red. Initials are touched up in red. Little distinction is made between the commentary on Lamentations 1 and that on 2.

The reference to the commentary as ‘expositio’ occurs also in *Ca1* and *Va2*. Interestingly, this is the term given to this work in the *Indiculum*: ‘Expositio Lamentationum.’

Shared Variants of Δ

The manuscripts categorized in this group share only a few errors in common. These are enough, however, to prove common ancestry.

1. Wording.

i. Copying errors:

Vt enim ferunt physici, in iecore calor decoctionis est. Sicut ergo iecur uel hepar suo calore crudum cibum in stomacho decoquit, et exinde succum nutritium in omnes corporis partes transmittit, sic nimirum hi qui alios per feruorem sue **deuotionis** a torpore ad bene operandum excitant quasi ex sua decoctione alimentum corpori Christi subministrant. (285D)

deuotionis] decoctionis Δ (*excepto Ca1 Va2 O4*)

ii. Additions:

Nullum enim certius indicium est uere caritatis quam affectus fraterne compassionis. (286A)

affectus fraterne compassionis] affectus **ibi** fraterne compassionis Δ

iii. Noteworthy variants:

Quando ergo **uitiis** seruire cogitur, quibus prius sponte consensit, quid aliud quam praeue consuetudini tributum soluit. (258D)

uitiis] inuitus Δ

In fact both ‘inuitus’ and ‘uitiis’ would be preferable here:

Quando ergo uitis inuitus seruire cogitur, quibus prius sponte consensit, quid aliud quam prae consuetudini tributum soluit. (When a man is forced to serve vices unwillingly, to which he previously consented of his own accord, what else does he do but pay tribute to wicked habit?)

The word 'inuitus' balances 'sponte', and stresses the idea of enslavement that Hugh is developing here. There is a strong case for including both words.

2. Word order

i.

Foris et non intus derelictus fuit Iob, qui exterius flagella carnis sustinuit, sed intus constantiam mentis non amisit. Intus et non extra **derelictus fuit** Dauid, cuius mentem intus sibi libido per consensum subdidit, sed prophetica foris admonitio ad penitentiam reuocauit. Intus et extra derelictus fuit prodigus ille in Euangelio filius, qui et luxuriose uiuens intus defluxit et fame tabescens, foris consolationem non inuenit. (261A)

derelictus fuit] fuit derelictus Δ

ii. Dicatur ergo: *Luxit antemurale et murus pariter dissipatus est*, quia inde **omnis priorum Patrum multitudo** doluit quod perfidus Iudeorum populus Saluatorem ad se missum non recepit. (279A)

omnis priorum Patrum multitudo] omnis Patrum priorum multitudo Δ

Shared Variants of Δ^1

1. Omissions

i. Whole phrases (but later added in the margin in *E*):

a.

Que uidelicet uirtutes, quandiu adhuc **imperfecte sunt et incipientes et necdum foras prodire possunt, sed intrinsecus adhuc** per gratiam eiusdem Spiritus nutriuntur, ut crescant et robuste fiant, quid aliud quam paruuli quidam in domo patris educantur, donec ad legitimam etatem perueniant? (259A)

imperfecte sunt et incipientes et necdum foras prodire possunt, sed intrinsecus adhuc] *om.* Δ^1 (*a.c.* *E*)

b. Per conquestionem **palpat, per increpationem, secat, per consolationem** ungit,...(264C)

palpat, per increpationem, secat, per consolationem] *om.* Δ^1 (*a.c.* *E*)

ii. Single words:

a. Ac si ipsi Ecclesie de membris eius arefactis loquatur et dicat: ‘Sicut prius cum fidem recte uiuendo tenuisti, **nulli** comparabilis fuit gloria tua, ita nunc cum per uitam reprobam a fide cecideris, nulli comparabilis est ignominia tua.’ (292A)

nulli] *om.* Δ^1 (*a.c.* *E*)

b.

Hinc est enim quod adiungit dicens: *Non est lex*. Animus enim legem intrinsecus habere debet, timorem uidelicet et amorem Dei, et ad huius legis iudicium sensus suos foris regere; timorem uidelicet, ne eum concupiscentia carnis per lasciuiam dissoluat; amorem uero, ne in bono opere **desidia** torpentem reddat. (282B). desidia] *om.* Δ^1 (*a.c.* *E*)

2. Wording errors

i. ...animus...iam solummodo ea refugit que affectus sensuum mala esse **renuntiat**. (282C)

renuntiat] enuntiat *om.* Δ^1 (*a.c. E*)

ii. Christum edimus quando Christum **credendo** diligimus. (289C)

credendo] edendo Δ (*a.c. E: cre add. in marg.*)

iii. Secundum sensum allegorie, nox sunt **peccatores**, maxille uero predicatores... (260A)

peccatores] pastores Δ (*a.c. E W*)

iv. ...sed in plateis oppidi, quia quanto maior est contritorum abiectio, tanto grauior est ideoque **pretiosior** dolentis compassio. (287B)

pretiosior] periculosior Δ (*a.c. E*)

These examples prove that this subgroup is marked by several grave errors, descending from a carelessly copied exemplar.

Shared Variants of Δ^2

Only a handful of variants characterize these manuscripts as a subgroup, most of which are hard to class as errors.

1. Wording

- i. ...et qui celestia contemplari consueuerant, cinerem sibi **superiniciunt**, ne uisum ad sublimia leuare queant. (284B)

superiniciunt] supermittunt Δ^2

- ii. Vnde per legem prohibitum est ne lucus **in atriis Domini** planteretur. (268B)

in atriis Domini] in atriis domus Domini Δ^2

2. Word order

- i. Quasi diceret: ‘Ciuitas que olim in tempore Daud et aliorum bonorum regum qui Deo placuerunt, **plena populo** fuit, attendite quare nunc sola remansit.’ (256D)

plena populo] populo plena Δ^2

- ii. Quia qui muliere **fimbriam contingente** quasi nouum aliquid passus interrogat, ‘Quis me tetigit?’, profecto declarat quod prius quamuis cunctis impingentibus et prementibus tactus non fuerit. (257C)

fimbriam contingente] contingente fimbriam Δ^2

G is full of corruptions. The abridgement *Vi* (and presumably *I*) shares one in particular:

i. Migravit Iudas **propter afflictionem** (263A)

propter afflictionem] populus afflictionis *G + Vi*

This error connects the Austrian manuscripts. But in several places where *G* is corrupt, *Vi* has the correct reading. It does not, therefore, descend from *G*.

Va2 and *Ca1* have a particular affinity, as can be seen from the these two common errors:

i.. Primo namque homini quasi dexteram Deus imposuit, quando peccanti plagam mortalitatis inflixit; **quam dexteram Deus adhuc confirmat quotiens primo uulneri cotidiana flagella superadicit.** (273A)

quam dexteram Deus adhuc confirmat quotiens primo uulneri cotidiana flagella superadicit.] *om. Ca + Va2*

ii. Sed uideamus primum **quomodo** bona obtineat, postea **quomodo** ad mala descendat. (259A)

quomodo] quot *Ca + Va2*

General remarks on the Δ group

The Δ archetype contained no serious corruptions. However, the earliest extant manuscripts in the group (*E*, *G* and *H*) are characterized by a host of idiosyncratic errors. Δ^1 , in particular, is marked by grave omissions. Δ^2 is much less corrupt (with the exception of *G*).

The Δ version was in circulation early on in the textual history of this work. It ultimately shares an archetype with the Σ group.³⁸³ It is therefore related to the Victorine copy. Moreover, its diffusion provides evidence that it was connected with St Victor.³⁸⁴

³⁸³ See below p.249.

³⁸⁴ See below pp.260-1.

iii. Ω Group

s.xii

Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, 69 (Cîteaux, Cistercian)	Di
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 345 (Christ Church, Canterbury, Benedictine)	O1

s.xiv

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 1778 (Library of Benedict XIII)	P7
--	----

The version of *Super Lamentationes* as represented by the Ω group probably had only a limited diffusion, judging by the small number of extant manuscripts which belong to it. All three belonged to important centres: *Di* to Cîteaux, the foundation-house of the Cistercian order, *O1* to Christ Church, Canterbury, and *P7* to the library of the Antipope, Benedict XIII (Pedro de Luna, d.1423).

Di **Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, 69³⁸⁵**

s.xii; Cîteaux, Cistercian; collection of works by Hugh; 117ff; 314 x 230mm; 2 columns of 33 lines; coloured initials and rubrication.

There is an *ex libris* from the twelfth or thirteenth century both on folio 3^r and folio 117^r: 'Liber Cistercii'. According to the catalogue, it is made of the embossed parchment of Cîteaux.

This manuscript probably dates from well into the second half of the twelfth century given certain features of the script.

³⁸⁵ CG, V, p.21.

There is a twelfth-century list of contents on folio 2^v. This is of great assistance, as some of the quires are out of order, a mishap which probably occurred when the volume was later rebound. Since the whole manuscript is devoted to texts by Hugh, I present first the list of contents on folio 2^v:

In hoc uolumine continentur hec:

Hugo in Lamentationibus Ieremie

Idem de throno Salomonis eburneo

Tractatus eiusdem de laude caritatis

De decem preceptis Decalogi

Sententie eiusdem multe et breues

Item de sapientia Christo et sapientia Christi

De cibo Emmanuelis

De tribus diebus

Expositio eiusdem super Magnificat

De uirginitate beate Marie

De institutione nouiciorum

The actual rubrics in the manuscript are as follows (I have indicated unidentified texts with an asterisk):

f.3^{ra} *Incipit explanatio Magistri Hugonis in Lamentationibus Ieremie*

f.38^{vb} *Idem de throno Salomonis eburneo* (= interpretation of 3 Kings 9:8-10)*

f.39^{va} *Item Magister Hugo* (Incipit ‘Tres sunt qui bellum suscitant’)*

f.40^{ra} *Incipit prologus Magistri Hugonis de laude caritatis. Explicit prologus.*

Incipit tractatus de laude caritatis

f.43^{rb} *De decem preceptis Decalogi*

f.45^{va} *De quinque statibus mutabilitatis humane* (= *Miscellanea* 1:77)

f.45^{vb} *De Petro et Iohanne, quis plus dilexerit uel dilectus sit* (= *Miscellanea* 1:98)

f.46^{va} *De eo quod supra (sic)* (= *Miscellanea* 1:97: *De duobus discipulis currentibus ad monumentum, altera epistula*)

- f.47^{ra} *De dispensatione* (= *Miscellanea* 1:153)
- f.47^{rb} *Quod Scriptura aliquando ostendit, aliquando tribuit uirtutem* (= *Miscellanea* 1:155)
- De duplici perfectione caritatis* (= *Miscellanea* 1:156)
- f.47^{va} *De terrore et blandimento Dei* (= *Miscellanea* 1:157)
- De respectu seruili**
- De seruitute Dei* (= *Miscellanea* 1:69)
- f.47^{vb} *De sex hydriis* (= *Miscellanea* 1:82)
- f.48^{rb} *Sermo de eo quod scriptum est, 'Unus est sermo Dei et efficax'*
(= *De sermone Dei*)
- f.51^{va} *De conformitate Christi* (= *Miscellanea* 1:71)
- f.51^{vb} (space left for rubric; = *Miscellanea* 2:55: *De forma, gratia et benedictione a Deo*)
- f.52^{va} *De obliuione preteritorum malorum et memoria et ira* (= *Miscellanea* 1:74)
- f.53^{rb} *Mysterium cathedre* (= *Miscellanea* 1:75)
- f.53^{va} *De refectione uerbi Dei* (= *Miscellanea* 1:161)
- f.54^{rb} *Quid retribuam Domino pro omnibus que retribuit mihi**
- f.54^{vb} *Incipit tractatus de substantia dilectionis* (end missing; comes below)
- f.56^{ra} (middle of *De cibo Emmanuelis*; beginning comes below)
- f.57^{vb} *Incipit de tribus diebus per ea que in meditatione constat speculatio rerum et post lectionem secunda est*
- f.63^{vb} (*De tribus diebus* ends mid-flow; the rest comes below)
- f.64^{ra} (end of *De substantia dilectionis*)
- f.64^{rb} *Quid significet quod scriptum est 'uiginti uiri quam benefaciens mulier'* (= *Miscellanea* 4:29)
- f.65^{ra} *De eo quod scriptum est 'quasi hortus uoluptatis terra coram eo'*
(= *Miscellanea* 1:70)
- f.65^{rb} *De uirtute uirtutum**
- f.71^{va} *De cibo Emmanuelis* (= beginning; end above)
- f.72^{rb} (end of *De tribus diebus*; beginning above)
- f.80^{ra} *Expositio Hugonis super Magnificat*

- f.90^b *Incipit prologus Magistri Hugonis <de uirginitate beate Marie>*
- f.90^{va} *Explicit prologus. Incipit liber Magistri Hugonis de uirginitate beate Marie*
- f.101^b *Incipit liber de institutione nouitiorum*
- f.116^b *Item eiusdem* (= *Miscellanea* 1:117: *De duplici gloria ueri Salomonis Christi a patre et matre*)
- f.117^{ra} *Item Magister Hugo* (= an exposition of the Song of Songs 6:12)*

Super Lamentationes is by far the longest work by Hugh in *Di*. The collection is largely devoted to shorter texts by Hugh,. There are sundry pieces, as we found in *V*. In fact, at least twelve of the texts here are also in that Victorine manuscript. Thus, we might say that *Di* is inclusive in a similar way to *V*, which possibly suggests an undertaking at Cîteaux to collect Hugh's *oeuvre*.

In addition to being the longest work in the volume, *Super Lamentationes* is placed first in the collection. It refers to the commentary as an *explanatio*, which, like *expositio*, stresses that it is a piece of exegesis. It is not the only work of an exegetical nature in *Di*. There are also line-by-line commentaries, such as expositions of the Decalogue and the 'Magnificat', alongside more homiletic pieces which take a particular Scriptural citation as a starting-point for setting forth doctrine. There would appear to be a monastic selection of works in this manuscript, of a Cistercian nature in particular. This would explain the presence of the three works one might class as mystical: *De laude caritatis*, *De substantia dilectionis*, *De tribus diebus*, the first two which are concerned with love, the third with the vanity of the world. In addition, it would explain the two Marian works, the *Expositio eiusdem super Magnificat* and *De uirginitate beate Marie*, as well as the instruction book for novices, *De institutione nouitiorum*.

Di has the greatest number of sense-headings in the margin. These are copied in a twelfth-century hand. They are used not only at changes of sense, but also in the middle of a particular section, as though to remind the reader which exposition is underway. Some of the 'extra' headings reveal a particular understanding of what each sense involves. Thus, in the middle of the historical

interpretation of 2:1-9, we find ‘alleg<orice>’ twice in the margin where there is metaphor:

i.

Tetendit arcum suum quasi inimicus. In arcu comminatio intelligitur. Arcum ergo tendere est comminationem amplificare uel differre. Qui autem post comminationem percutit, quasi inimicus arcum tetendit. (266C)

ii.

Vel per humiliatum, ordinem prelatorum accipere possumus, per humiliatam, plebem subiectam. Contra quod superius in uastatione regionis dixerat, *Polluit regnum et principes eius*, ut idem per regnum quod per humiliatam, idem per principes quod per humiliatum intelligamus. (267D)

In *Di*, the discussion of original sin is marked as allegorical, but then, in the middle of the exposition of 2:2 and 2:3, we find ‘Mor<aliter>’ in the margin. This could be explained by the fact that here the subject-matter certainly covers what we would associate more with the tropological sense:

i.

Sed destructa sunt speciosa Iacob, quia Deus in ultionem primi reatus a mente eius inuisibilium bonorum cognitionem abscondit et uisibilium rerum aspectum ab illa spirituali iucunditate in concupiscentiam carnis commutauit. (271C)

ii.

Auertit retrorsum etc. Primum hominem in uia obedientie ambulanti Diabolus sequebatur, ut eum reuocaret, sed accessum nocendi ad hominem habere non potuit, quia dextera Dei inter illum et hominem fuit. (272B).

‘Allegorical’ is also applied to parts of Hugh’s presentation of the destruction of Jerusalem as a figure for God’s punishment and rejection of the Jewish people. But the opening of this part of the commentary is heralded by ‘historice’, which implies that the section to follow falls under this heading:

Ad populum etiam Iudaicum hoc specialiter referri potest. Considerans namque Propheta qualiter Deus post eiectionem primi hominis misereri uolens humano generi, solum hunc populum elegit, ut in eo nostre salutis exordia prepararet, quomodo illum date legis mandatis coluit et sua ubique protectione sublimauit, et post hec omnia peccantem et preuaricantem abiecit, et ita prime abiectiōi secundam adnumerans plangit dicens: *Factus est Dominus uelut inimicus.* (274C)

The mention of the Jewish people doubtless prompted this attribution. *Di* is not alone in making it.³⁸⁶ But several do mark this section as an allegorical interpretation, as would be expected.

The text of the commentary has frequent stress marks. This suggests that it was used to aid public reading.

O1 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 345³⁸⁷

s.xii; Christ Church, Canterbury, Benedictine; collection of works by Hugh; 124ff.; 350 x 240mm (235 x 167mm); 2 columns of 40 lines; blue and red decorated initials; rubrication in red.

Its provenance is clear from the 'nota bene' signs so characteristic of Christ Church manuscripts. It belonged to the library of this institution at least until the sixteenth century.³⁸⁸ However, *O1* did not originate from the scriptorium of Christ Church. Thomas Becket gave it to this abbey along with other books which he brought back from his exile in France.³⁸⁹ Indeed, on a flyleaf at the beginning of the manuscript, there are the initials ^{'S.T.'}~~the~~³⁹⁰ The decorated initials have been identified as representing the 'Pontigny'-style of illumination.³⁹¹ Becket spent two years at

³⁸⁶ See below p.271.

³⁸⁷ F. Madan, H. H. E. Craster and N. Denholm-Young, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford which have not hitherto been described in the Quarto Series* (Oxford, 1922), V, pp.384-5.

³⁸⁸ M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903), p.159.

³⁸⁹ C. F. R. de Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade* (Woodbridge, New Hampshire, 1984), p.98.

³⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.40.

³⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p.45.

this Cistercian abbey (between 1164 and 1166) and may have had books copied either here or at St Colombe, which, like Pontigny, was in the diocese of Sens.³⁹² Thus we can be more precise about both the provenance and date of *O1*. It was probably copied either at Pontigny or St Colombe before Thomas's return to England in 1170. His death on 29 December 1170 provides us with a 'terminus ante quem'.³⁹³

O1 contains four major works by Hugh:

f.1^{ra} *Hic est tractatus Magistri Hugonis in libro Ecclesiaste*

f.48^{ra} *Explicit tractatus Magistri Hugonis in libro Ecclesiaste. Incipit tractatus eiusdem in Lamentationibus Ieremie*

f.69^{ra} *Explicit tractatus Magistri Hugonis in Lamentationibus Ieremie. Incipit eiusdem expositio super angelicam hierarchiam Sancti Dionysii Areopagite*

f.93^{ra} *Incipit liber Magistri Hugonis canonici Sancti Victoris de archa Noe pro archa sapientie cum archa Ecclesie et archa matris gratie*

All these enjoyed considerable diffusion. They are all linked through their exegetical nature. The first three are works of exegesis in the stricter sense of line-by-line exposition. *De archa Noe* did not follow a biblical text as such, but was exegetical in the sense of expounding Noah's ark, drawing out its variety of symbolism.

O1 has much fewer sense headings in the margin than *Di*. In the commentary on Lamentations 2, they are employed only sporadically for changes of sense.

³⁹² Ibid., p.76-77.

³⁹³ Ibid., p.38.

P7 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 1778³⁹⁴

s.xiv; Library of Benedict XIII, Avignon; miscellaneous classical, patristic and medieval works: John Chrysostom, Ernardus Bonaevallensis, Hugh, Sidonius Apollinaris, Sallust, Pseudo-Sallust, Pseudo-Cicero, Cicero, *Iter Ierosolomitenum*, Jerome, Augustine, Marsilius of Padua; 263ff.; 320 x 250mm; 2 columns of 49 lines; coloured initials and rubrics.

On folio 111^r, there is the date 1374. Benedict XIII was antipope from 1390 to 1417. From 1408 onwards, he retreated from Avignon first to Perpignan and then to his castle at Peñiscola near Valencia, to which residence he transported many of the books of the palace library at Avignon. Of this collection at Peñinscola there exists a catalogue dating from 1412 to 1415.³⁹⁵ Number 400 in this catalogue has the following entry:

Folio 62^v Chrysostomus super Mattheum et Bernardus de ultimis verbis Domini epistolae Gaisoli. Apollinaris Sidonii episcopi scriptum qualiter clavis et catena Domini sunt oblata, et ecclesiam beati Dionysii Ariopagite, et de institutione indicti, ac de uisione Caroli Calui, sermo beate Hieronymi de assumptione beate Marie et defensorium pacis.

P7 has been identified with this listed manuscript.³⁹⁶ The catalogue description for the Bibliothèque Nationale certainly has some overlapping references: John Chrysostom on Matthew, Sidonius Apollinaris and the *Defensor pacis* of Marsilius of Padua. In both accounts, the first and last works are identical (i.e. Chrysostom and Marsilius). But the extant manuscript contains works which are not cited in the medieval description, most notably the texts by and attributed to Sallust and Cicero as well as *Super Lamentationes*. It would be necessary to

³⁹⁴ BN, II, pp.170-1.

³⁹⁵ The catalogue is printed in M. Faucon, *La librairie des papes d'Avignon. Sa formation, sa composition, ses catalogues (1316-1420)*, II, pp. 43-151 (Paris, 1886). For the date of this catalogue, see M-H. Jullien de Pommerol and Jacques Monfrin, *La bibliothèque pontificale à Avignon et à Peñiscola* (Rome, 1991) I, pp.xxxiv, 43-4.

³⁹⁶ De Pommerol and Monfrin, *Librairie*, p.936.

examine the manuscript in order to ascertain whether it is composite, as the range of contents suggests.³⁹⁷

Among the items not mentioned in the medieval description is Jerome's *Letter* 30 to Paula, which discusses the significance of the Hebrew letters.

Super Lamentationes lacks a title. In the catalogues both for Urban V's library and that of Benedict XIII, it is referred to as '[Hugo]...super Trenis', 'expositio...super librum Treannorum (sic)' and 'Item expositio de Trennis'.³⁹⁸

³⁹⁷ I have as yet only examined a print-out of the section which contains this commentary.

³⁹⁸ See below p.263.

Shared Variants of Ω

1. Omissions

i. Vel ideo plebs in captiuitate posita, in abscondito plorat, quia tristitiam suam manifestare non audet propter crudeles dominos quibus subiecta est, ne erga se maiorem **eorum** excitaret iracundiam, si de sua seruitute tristis appareret. (259D)

eorum] *om.* Ω

ii. Hucusque desolationem filie Syon, id est regionis Iudee planxisse uidetur. Nunc ad ipsam matrem Syon, scilicet **ciuitatem** Ierusalem, deplorandam se conuertit dicens... (267B)

ciuitatem] *om.* Ω

iii. Quod autem dixit *pariter*, sic accipi potest: uel quod murus pariter cum antemurali luxerit, uel quod murus pariter **cum antemurali** dissipatus sit. (279B)

cum antemurali] *om.* Ω

2. Word order

i. Vnde **cum graui dolore** pronuntiandum est *quasi inimicus, quasi hostis*,... (266D)

cum graui dolore] graui cum dolore Ω

ii. Postquam autem spiritus contra Deum tumuit, statim **contumeliam contradictionis** in carne sua inuenit,... (271D)

contumeliam contradictionis] contradictionis contumeliam Ω

3. Wording

i.

Dicat ergo: *Quomodo obtexit caligine in furore suo Dominus filiam Syon*, quia hominem, quem ad contemplandum lumen veritatis creauerat, peccantem deserens in tenebris ignorantie reliquit. Syon namque interpretatur **specula**, ubi hostium incursus de longe prospicitur. Primo autem homini dictum est: *De ligno scientie boni et mali ne comedas. Quacunque enim die comederis ex eo, morte morieris*. Homo ergo quasi in quadam specula erigitur, quando imminentis mali periculum per circumspectionem cauere iubetur. (270A-B)

specula] speculatio Ω

The word ‘specula’ is required here as ‘speculatio’ does not evoke the image of the look-out from which man watches for the approaching enemy, wickedness. Moreover, the word ‘specula’ is repeated in this context a line further on. But in one sense ‘speculatio’ is not wrong, for this is what the name of Zion is interpreted as meaning,³⁹⁹ as is confirmed by the sentences following this passage:

Quid igitur per filiam Syon, nisi animam hominis nondum adhuc usu circumspectionis roboratam accipere debemus? Nam sicut dicimus ‘filia Babilonis’, id est filia confusionis, et ‘filia Ierusalem’, id est filia contemplationis, sic dicitur ‘**filia Syon**’, **id est filia speculationis**, quasi in speculatione adhuc tenera et nouella et necdum in uirile robur solidata. (270B)

ii. Later in the commentary we find the Ω witnesses employing a synonym which is plausible in the context (*G* of the Δ group also has this reading):

Quod est dicere: ‘Alia mala etsi per differentiam quandam tibi comparari possunt, sed nulla per equalitatem possunt. Quare? Sequitur: *Magna enim uelut mare contritio tua*. Mirum est quod calamitatem eius nulli **coequari** posse commemorat, et statim magnitudinem maris ei in comparatione coequat. Sed sic intelligendum est ac si diceret: ‘Quemadmodum mare super

³⁹⁹ See Jerome, *Liber interpretationum Hebraicorum nominum*.

omnes alias aquas et mole et amaritudine excellens est, ita tue contritioni nulla calamitas coequari potest.’ (291D)

coequari] comparari Ω

iii. These three manuscripts have interesting readings at a point where some addition is required:

Mater ergo Christi, hoc est Synagoga, hortus est conclusus. **Soror Christi**, id est Ecclesia, hortus conclusus. (275C)

Soror Christi] Soror autem Christi *Di*, Soror uero Christi *P7*, Soror ergo Christi *O1*

Such a word at this point balances ‘Mater ergo Christi’. *O1*’s reading is surely inappropriate, as there would not be a repetition of ‘ergo’. The variants of the other two are plausible.

P7 It has a particular affinity with *Di*:

i. Quod autem dicit *muros turrium*, **quantum ad litteram sic intelligendum est** ac si diceret ‘turres muratas eius’ intransitiue, hoc est non solum muros ciuitatis extrinsecus, sed muros turrium intrinsecus. (269A)

quantum ad litteram sic intelligendum est] quantum ad litteram **spectat** sic intelligendum est *Di + P7*

ii. Vnde bene subditur: *Perdidit et contriuit uectes eius*.

uectes] omnes uectes *Di + P7*

iii. Per contritionem autem **irreparabilis** calamitas ostenditur, sicut quod contritum est amplius non reparatur. (286B)

irreparabilis] inseparabilis *Di + P7*

iv. Quid per effusionem iecoris nisi **afflictio** carnis signatur? (286D)

afflictio] affectio *Di + P7*

At one point, where there is a citation from John (5:16), both manuscripts have the pronoun of the Vulgate reading, unlike the other witnesses which have the following:

Non pro eo dico ut oret quis.

eo] illo *Di + P7*

In spite of such affinities, *P7* is not descended directly from *Di*, for it does not include all the errors of the latter. It also shares a few variants with *O1*, though only minor ones to do with word order, such as the following:

i. Ideo generali nomine premissso, statim speciale nomen adiunxit, **ut duarum se tribuum captiuitatem plangere demonstraret.**

ut duarum se tribuum captiuitatem plangere demonstraret] ut duarum tribuum se captiuitatem plangere demonstraret *O1 + P7*, ut duarum tribuum captiuitatem plangere se demonstraret *Di*

ii. ...hic iam **aliquid amplius** dicere uolens...

aliquid amplius] amplius aliquid *O1 + P7*

There are a few readings shared by \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{O}_1 alone. In the title, for example, they both put Lamentations in the ablative case after ‘in’, where an accusative is more common. Another instance of a shared reading occurs where the subject of a particular clause is misunderstood, resulting in a plural verb where it should be singular:

Gentes sunt desideria carnis que nobis secundum corruptionem prime natiuitatis ingenita sunt et legi mentis contradicunt, quibus tunc bene anima dominatur quando Deo perfecte **subicitur**. (258B)

subicitur] subiciuntur *Di + O1*

General remarks on the Ω group

Unlike the Σ and Δ groups, none of the Ω manuscripts are early witnesses. Both the twelfth-century manuscripts date from after the mid-1160s. But the version contained in them is comparatively free of errors. Their corruptions are not serious. It is a manuscript of this group, *Di*, which has served as base text. The reasons for selecting this copy were that it was a twelfth-century manuscript which supplemented the Σ version (i.e. did not share its omissions), while avoiding the numerous corruptions of *G* and Δ^1 .

iv. Θ Group

s.xii

Rheims, Bibliothèque municipale, 446 (St Thierry, Benedictine)	Re
Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 558	T1
Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 637 (Clairvaux, Cistercian)	T2
Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 1044 (St Etienne de Troyes)	T3

s.xiii

Lisbon, Biblioteca Nacional Alcobaça, 242 (France)	Li
--	----

s.xv

Soissons, Bibliothèque municipale, 130 (Villeneuve, Celestine)	S
--	---

The Θ group comes from the Champagne region. The manuscripts are concentrated in one area. Three of the witnesses come from the Troyes region, one from Rheims and one from Villeneuve near Soissons. The oldest witnesses date from no earlier than 1170. Two of them can be located to major monastic centres, Clairvaux and St Thierry. This group has a striking characteristic, namely that after Hugh’s interpretation of Lamentations 1:3, where his commentary on the first book ends, excerpts from Paschasius Radbertus’s text is supplied on the remaining nineteen verses of Lamentations 1.⁴⁰⁰ In *Re*, *T1*, *T2* and *Li*, this interpolation is followed by the words: ‘Finit Paschasii. Item ex tractatu Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie Prophete.’

⁴⁰⁰ Incipit: ‘Interrogate uias sempiternas. id est patriarchas et prophetas’ (*PL* 120, col. 1071A). Explicit: ‘...sed unusquisque recipiat prout gessit’ (*PL* 120, col. 1102B).

Re Rheims, Bibliothèque municipale, 446⁴⁰¹

s.xii; St Thierry, Benedictine; miscellaneous works: Hugh, Bernard, Hugh of Fouilloy, Pseudo-Cyprian, Richard, Galland of Rigny, Anselm; 202ff.; 452 x 310mm; 2 columns of 49 lines; red, blue and green coloured initials.

Features of the script date from the end of the twelfth century. In size, *Re* is the largest manuscript to contain *Super Lamentationes*, even exceeding *V* in format. The whole book is made of fine parchment and some of the decorated initials are finely executed. The size and quality suggest it was a highly valued collection at St Thierry.

The opening work in *Re* is Hugh's *De sacramentis*. It is followed by Bernard's *Apologeticus* to William of St Thierry, suitably included given that the latter was abbot of St Thierry between 1131 and 1135, before joining the Cistercians at Clairvaux. *Super Lamentationes* follows this work. From this point on, there is striking overlap, in terms of contents, with two manuscripts from Troyes, *T1* and *T2*. For this reason I list the rubrics in full:

f.117^{ra} *Tractatus Magistri Hugonis de Folieto prioris canonicorum Sancti Laurentii in pago Ambianensi super Lamentationes Ieremie Prophete*

f.139^{rb} *Incipit prologus Magistri Hugonis de sequenti opere...Explicit prologus*
Incipit liber Magistri Hugonis de ordinatione claustris materialis
(= Book 2 of *De claustris anime*)

f.149^{vb} *Explicit tractatus Magistri Hugonis de Folieto de claustris materialibus*
Item eiusdem tractatus de claustris anime

f.154^{vb} *Explicit liber claustralium tam canonicorum quam monachorum*
*Denotatio quindecim graduum*⁴⁰²

f.155^{rb} *Incipit liber Sancti Cypriani martyris de duodecim abusibus seculi*

f.159^{ra} *Incipit Magistri Ricardi liber primus de patriarchis* (= Benjamin minor)

f.175^{vb} *Explicit liber Ricardi de patriarchis. Incipit eiusdem de exterminatione*

⁴⁰¹ CG, 38, pp.606-609.

⁴⁰² I have not identified this work.

mali et promotione boni

f.188^{rb} *Prefaciuncula sequentis operis...Incipit libellus prouerbiorum* (= Galland de Rigny, *Libellus Proverbiorum*)⁴⁰³

f.198^{rb} *Prologus Anselmi archiepiscopi in libro de beatitudine celestis patrie*
Incipit liber Anselmi archiepiscopi celestis patrie

f.202^r *Explicit liber de beatitudine celestis patrie*

With the exception of the opening two works, *Re* shares identical contents and, for the most part, rubrics with *T1* and *T2*. However, it leaves out one work they both include and does not conform precisely to their order of works. Furthermore, its presentation of the *Libellus prouerbiorum* of Galland de Rigny differs from that of *T1* and *T2*. The latter manuscripts present the glosses that form part of the work in smaller font in a column to the right of the proverb and continued below it. *Re* presents proverb and gloss as a continuous text, employing the marginal indicators 'Textus' and 'Glossa' to distinguish between the two.

Yet again we find *Super Lamentationes* circulating with Hugh of Fouilloy's *De clauastro anime*, parts of which follow the former text. *Super Lamentationes* is wrongly attributed to Hugh of Fouilloy, as is apparent from its opening rubric.

Two works of Richard also figure. In fact, we have a run of works which are also contained in *Ma*, the thirteenth-century collection of Richard and Hugh closely related to *V*, and which also shares the description of Hugh of Fouilloy which we find in *Re* (and *T1* and *T2*, as we shall see): '...ab Hugone, priore canonicorum Sancti Laurentii in pago Ambianensi.'⁴⁰⁴ The overlap in contact does strongly suggest some connection between these Champagne manuscripts and *Ma*. But there is no apparent textual link as regards *Super Lamentationes*.

Apart from the nine-line decorated initial 'Q' at the opening of the commentary, one other *littera notabilior* occurs in the text, namely a seven-line 'M' of 'Medicus' at the start of the prologue to the commentary on Lamentations

⁴⁰³ This is an attribution of J. Châtillon, 'Le recueil de Proverbes glosés du cistercien Galland de Rigny', *Revue du Moyen-Age Latin*, 9 (1953), 10-12. He dates the work to before the death of Bernard in 1153, since in one manuscript it is addressed to this leading figure (p.13).

⁴⁰⁴ See above pp.117-18.

2. This can be regarded as the division in the commentary. The exposition is not distinguished by sense headings in the margin or in the line, with one exception, where 'Moraliter' is written within the text block before 'Migrauit...' (262D). Some of the other manuscripts which generally lack sense headings include this word at the same point, for example, V and G.

S Soissons, Bibliothèque municipale, 130⁴⁰⁵

s.xv, Villeneuve, Celestine; miscellany of works: Bonaventure, Peter of Ailly (d.1420), Psalms, Gregory, Commentary on Song of Songs, Bernard and others; paper; 116ff; composite, as indicated by the varying measurements for pages;⁴⁰⁶ single text block and 2 columns; several different hands; for *Super Lamentationes*: red coloured initials and red correction.

There is an *ex libris* on folio 1^r: 'Celestinorum de Sra.' The manuscript contains a text by Peter of Ailly (1350-1420), Cardinal of Cambrai, who came from Compiègne, about forty miles from Villeneuve.

Super Lamentationes lacks a title. At the point where Paschasius's commentary is inserted, there is a marginal note as follows: 'Tractatus Paschasii nescio cuius.' S is also an unfinished copy, breaking off in the middle of Paschasius's interpretation of 1:6. It is followed by three empty folios.

S is related to *Re*, as it shares a number of variants with it and does not include the errors of the Troyes manuscripts.

⁴⁰⁵ CG, III, pp.110-11.

⁴⁰⁶ For example, f.2, = 130 x 97mm; f.16 = 136 x 97mm, f.112r = 128 x 94mm, f.115 = 122 x 94mm, f.116 = 127 x 94mm (varying measurements for text block, e.g. f.2 = 105 x 80mm, f.16 = 97 x 78mm, f.23 = 100 x 75mm, f.27 = 114 x 76mm, f.34 = 95 x 80mm, f.67, (2 columns) = 112 x 78mm, f.113 = 110 x 70mm).

T1 Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 558⁴⁰⁷

s.xii; miscellaneous works: Hugh, Hugh of Fouilloy, Pseudo-Cyprian, Jerome, Richard, Anselm, Bernard; 303 x 214mm (251 x 164mm); 2 columns of 41 lines; coloured initials.

The foliation indicates that this manuscript lacks its beginning. Alongside the modern foliation in Arabic numerals, much older Roman numerals are visible, starting on folio 2^r with 'ix'.

Features of the script date this manuscript to the late twelfth century. It is very closely related to the manuscript *T2*. *T1* contains only one work not found in the manuscript from Clairvaux, namely the final text, Bernard's *De consideratione*. This work has a particular association with Clairvaux, not only because it was composed by its founder and leading light, but also because it was addressed to Pope Eugenius III, who was himself a monk at Clairvaux from 1135 until his appointment as abbot in Rome and eventually pope in 1145.⁴⁰⁸ *T1*'s textual closeness with *T2*, coupled with the fact it contains a work associated with Clairvaux, might suggest that it originated from this institution. The missing folios at the beginning may have contained an *ex libris*. The fifteenth-century catalogue entry for Clairvaux, however, only cites one copy of *Super Lamentationes*.⁴⁰⁹ But it is possible that identical copies were not registered.

The quality of the parchment deserves attention. It is remarkably discoloured throughout, appearing as though some yellowish substance had made blots. This may be a clue to its frequent consultation or even to its possible use as an exemplar.

The lost folios certainly contained the opening of Hugh's *Super Lamentationes* and the first part of the excerpts from that of Paschasius, because the opening words on the first folio come from the latter.⁴¹⁰ On folio 4^v, there is confirmation of what text was missing, with the notable attribution which occurs in most of the Θ witnesses: 'Finit Paschasii. Item ex tractatu Magistri

⁴⁰⁷ CG, II, pp.242-244.

⁴⁰⁸ ODCC, p.571.

⁴⁰⁹ André Vernet, *La Bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Clairvaux du douzième au dix-huitième siècle* (Paris, 1979), I, p.155, no. 704.

⁴¹⁰ This explains why the modern catalogue wrongly attributes the whole text to Paschasius.

Hugonis.’ I list here the works with their rubrics which follow Hugh’s *Super Lamentationes*:

f.28^{ra} *Incipit prologus Magistri Hugonis de sequenti opere...Explicit prologus. Incipit liber Magistri Hugonis de ordinatione claustru materiali*<s>

f.42^{rb} *Explicit tractatus Hugonis de Folieto prioris canonicorum Sancti Laurentii in pago Ambianensi de claustru materiali. Item eiusdem de claustru anime*

f.55^{vb} *Explicit liber claustralium tam canonicorum quam monachorum
Denotatio quindecim graduum*

f.56^{va} *Incipit liber Sancti Cypriani martyris de duodecim abusiuis seculi*

f.61^{ra} *Incipit epistula Sancti Iheronimi de lapsu cuiusdam uirginis*

f.63^{vb} *Expliciunt dicta Sancti Iheronimi de lapsu uirginis consecrate
Item ad uiolatorem uirginis*

(f.64^{ra}) *Carmen eiusdem de puella*

f.64^{vb} *Explicit liber Sancti Iheronimi de lapsu cuiusdam uirginis
De septem gradibus anime*

f.65^{vb} *Incipit liber Magistri Ricardi de Patriarchis*

f.89^{vb} *Prefaciuncula sequentis operis...Incipit libellus Prouerbiorum*

f.105^{ra} *Explicit liber. De exterminatione mali et promotione boni*

f.122^{ra} *Prologus Anselmi archiepiscopi in libro de beatitudine celestis patrie.
Incipit liber Anselmi archiepiscopi de beatitudine celestis patrie*

f.126^{vb} *Explicit liber de beatitudine celestis patrie. Incipit liber primus Domini Bernardi abbatis de consideratione ad Eugenium papam*

All the texts, with the exception of the pieces by Jerome, correspond to the majority of those contained in *Re*. The order is almost the same, except that in *Tl*, Richard’s *De exterminatione mali* does not follow his *Beniamin minor*.

The shared rubrics are almost identical. The exceptions are the following:

a.

Re Incipit liber Magistri Hugonis de ordinatione claustr^u materialis

T1 Incipit liber Magistri Hugonis de ordinatione claustr^u materialⁱ

T1 mistakenly has ‘materiali’ as though this were a second declension adjective. Alternatively, it is understood to be qualifying ‘ordinatione’.

b.

*Re Explicit tractatus Magistri Hugonis de Folieto de claustr^o materiali.
Item eiusdem tractatus de claustr^o anime*

*T1 Explicit tractatus Hugonis de Folieto prioris canonicorum Sancti
Laurentii in pago Ambianensi de claustr^o materiali.*

T1, it will be noted, omits the word ‘Magistri’. As we have seen, *Re* places the full description of Hugh of Fouilloy before *Super Lamentationes*. *T1* and *T2* simply refer to ‘Master Hugh’ before this work. They include nothing which distinguishes this Hugh from Hugh of Fouilloy. It is, therefore, possible that they both share *Re*’s false ascription. (In a contents list in *T2*, however, possibly dating from the twelfth century, there is a distinction between ‘Master Hugh’ and ‘Master Hugh of Fouilloy’.)

c.

Re Incipit eiusdem de exterminatione mali et promotione boni

T1 De exterminatione mali et promotione boni

T1 does not have ‘Incipit’. (The omission of ‘eiusdem’ is explained by the fact that in *T1* this work does not follow another text by Richard.)

The remarkable similarity in contents and rubrics can leave no doubt that these two manuscripts are closely related. In light of *T1*'s small omissions in the rubrics which are not shared by *Re*, it is likely that the latter is closer to the exemplar of this group.

T2 Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 637⁴¹¹

s.xii; Clairvaux, Cistercian; miscellany of works: Hugh, Hugh of Fouilloy, Pseudo-Cyprian, Jerome, Richard, Galland of Rigny, Anselm; 199ff.; 307 x 210mm (238 x 158mm); 2 columns of 30 lines; red, blue and green coloured initials; red rubrication; flyleaf i has a table of contents in red, possibly written in the twelfth century, with a later note in black ink adding those works missing from the middle of the contents list.

There is a *ex libris* on the paste sheet at the end of the manuscript: 'Liber Sancte Marie Clareuallis.' This can probably be dated to the twelfth-century. All the texts contained in *T2* are also found in *T1*:

f.1^{ra} *Tractatus Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie*

f.49^{va} *Incipit prologus Magistri Hugonis de sequenti opere...Explicit prologus. Incipit liber Magistri Hugonis de ordinatione claustru materiali<s>*
(= Book II of *De claustru anime*)

f.72^{ra} *Explicit tractatus Hugonis de Folieto prioris canonicorum Sancti Laurentii in pago Ambianensi de claustru materiali. Item eiusdem de claustru anime* (= Book III of *De claustru anime*)

f.93^{rb} *Denotatio quindecim graduum*

f.94^{va} *Incipit liber Sancti Cypriani martyris de duodecim abusiuis seculi*

f.100^{ra} *Incipit epistola Sancti Ieronimi de lapsu cuiusdam uirginis*

f.103^{rb} *Expliciunt dicta Sancti Ieronimi de lapsu uirginis*

Item ad uiolatorem uirginis

f.104^{rb} *Carmen eiusdem de puella*

f.106^{va} *Explicit liber Sancti Ieronimi de lapsu cuiusdam uirginis*

⁴¹¹ CG, II, pp.268-69.

f.106^{va} *De septem gradibus anime*

f.108^{ra} *Incipit liber Magistri Ricardi de Patriarchis*

f.145^{ra} *Explicit liber Ricardi de Patriarchis; Prefaciuncula sequentis operis...Incipit libellus prouerbiorum*

f.160^{vb} *Apologia seu satisfactio ad lectorem...Explicit liber*

f.161^{ra} *De exterminatione mali et promotione boni*

f.187^v *Prologus Anselmi archiepiscopi in libro de beatitudine celestis patrie...*

Incipit liber Anselmi archiepiscopi de beatitudine celestis patrie

f.195^{ra} *Explicit liber de beatitudine celestis patrie*

T2 does not share the closing text of *T1*, Bernard's *De consideratione*. In addition, it lacks one rubric which is in *T1* (and *Re*), but space is left for an 'explicit' to be added:

Explicit liber claustralium tam canonicorum quam monachorum

It is likely, therefore, that *T2* descends from *T1*.⁴¹²

T3 Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 1044⁴¹³

s.xii, St Etienne de Troyes; *Super Lamentationes*; 54ff.; 260 x 170mm (190 x 104mm excluding elongated ascenders); 2 elaborate illuminated initials (red, blue, reddish-mauve-brown, green, grey, pink, gold-plate); red and blue initials used throughout; rubrication.

There is an *ex libris* on the paste sheet at the end, possibly dating from the thirteenth century: 'Iste liber est ecclesie Sancti Stephani Trecensis.'

⁴¹² I have only been able to collate *T1* in Troyes and at the Hugo-von-Sankt-Viktor-Institut on microfilm. I am not, therefore, in a position to affirm its priority over *T2*. J. Châtillon, 'Le *Duodecim Patriarchis* ou *Beniamin minor* de Richard de Saint-Victor: description et essai de classification des manuscrits', *Revue d'histoire des textes*, 21 (1991), 228, believes *T2* might be the common ancestor of *Re* and *T1* for the *Beniamin Minor*. With reference to *Super Lamentationes*, it is impossible that *Re* descends from *T1*, given the omissions in the latter. See below, pp.187-8.

⁴¹³ CG, II, p.430.

T3 is clearly an expensive *de luxe* copy, possibly made for an aristocrat.⁴¹⁴ This manuscript, and *O2*, are the only surviving examples of costly and ornate copies of the work. The parchment of *T3* is of the highest quality; the opening initial (as well as another one later on) is a fine multicoloured illumination, emblazoned with gold. The scripts employed are clearly aimed to impress, sparing no parchment. The manuscript contains this text alone and is of a size which might suggest it was a personal copy rather than a book for display in an ecclesiastical institution.

The ruling pattern is very pronounced. Moreover, the *mise-en-page* is unique. Its pages have whole verses of Lamentations laid out in columns in large letters, accompanied by their Hebrew letters (which may have been added later). The actual commentary runs down the side of each verse and in the space beneath, with sense changes signposted. Hugh's commentary is thus set out as a marginal gloss. Such a lay-out is peculiar to glossed books of the Bible, though, in *T3*, there is no interlinear gloss. The title given to the work confirms that this is a glossed book of the Bible: 'Incipit Liber Lamentationum Ieremie Prophete secundum Magistrum Hugonem.'

Colour is employed to articulate the text. The Hebrew letters in the margin (before the biblical verse) are red. The initial of each new verse is a blue *littera notabilior*. The lemmata in the actual commentary are both initialled and underlined in red. Unabbreviated sense headings in red are added in the margin.

Whatever its ownership, later marginal notes, possibly dating from the fifteenth century, suggest an active readership. 'Nota bene' signs abound, one in particular opening with the words, 'O lector'. Furthermore, a later reader has supplied pointers to the themes in the text by means of topic headings in the margin, such as 'Iacob supplantator', 'Babylonis, Ierusalem', 'De populo Iudaico', 'De Ecclesia et Synagoga'.

Textual evidence shows that *T3* is very closely related to *T1* and *T2*, probably even descended from one of these. However, at one point it has a striking difference, namely, where the extract from Paschasius Radbertus ends and Hugh's commentary is resumed:

⁴¹⁴ This suggestion was made to me by Patricia Stirnemann.

Re + T1 + T2: Finit Paschasii. Item ex tractatu Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie prophete.

T3 Explicit prima pars secundum Paschasium. Incipit secundum alphabetum secundum tractatum Magistri Hugonis canonici beati Victoris, uiri christianissimi.

This is doubtless an expansion of the former. There is an obvious mistake here, since some of the first part is not by Paschasius, which is recognized in the rubric at the beginning of *T3*. It is worth noting that unlike the other Champagne manuscripts, the copiest was in no doubt which Hugh this was, as Saint Victor is here specified.

Li Lisbon, Biblioteca Nacional Alcobaça, 242⁴¹⁵

s.xiii; France; Hugh; 161ff.; 349 x 240mm (253 x 150mm); 2 columns of 29 lines; coloured initials.

The decorated initial at the start of the commentary is French in style. The textual relationship between *Li* and the three manuscripts from Troyes suggests Champagne as the origin of this thirteenth-century witness. However, there is no overlap in other contents. *Li* includes one other work, Hugh's *In Ecclesiasten*. The order is as follows:

f.1^{va} ***Tractatus Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie***

f.61^{ra} ***Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis in expositione Ecclesiaste***

It is thus a manuscript devoted to Hugh's two major biblical commentaries.

⁴¹⁵ *Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa: Inventario dos codices alcobacenses* (Lisbon, 1930), I, p.211; T. L. Amos, *The 'Fundo Alcobaça' of the Biblioteca Nacional, Lisbon* (Collegeville, Minnesota), II, pp.169-170.

Shared Variants of Θ Group

The Θ group is characterized by variants which are for the most part hard to categorize as errors. Only a few can be considered mistakes.

1. Errors.

a. Qui enim sunt persecutores nostri nisi maligni spiritus et desideria carnis, que militant contra nos in membris nostris, et que est angustia nisi desperatio peccatricis conscientie, que intus **cor stringit**. (264A)

cor stringit] constringit Θ

b). Quando in Scriptura dextera Dei ponitur, aliquando protectio, aliquando grauis percussio designatur, eo quod dextera naturali habilitate ad percutiendum sit promptior. Prius ergo Deus **dexteram** auertit ne protegeret, postea dexteram firmauit ut feriret. (266C)

dexteram] sinistram Θ

c). Vel nox **hanc** ipsam qua uiuimus presentem uitam significare potest, quando adhuc ad inuicem conscientias nostras non uidemus. (260A)

hanc] *om.* Θ

d). Vel per humiliatum et humiliatam sensum et cogitationem accipere possumus, ut (anima) intus et foris contumeliis **agatur**, donec confusa ad penitentiam redeat. (27AC)

agatur] angatur Θ

The Θ reading is appropriate in the context. But Hugh is here using Paschasius Radbertus's words verbatim, and the latter employs the verb 'ago'.

e). Sequitur: ***Proiecit** de celo in terram inclutam Israel.*

Proiecit] Proiecit Dominus Θ

This last error is hardly serious, but it does tamper with the biblical lemma by adding a word.

2. Additions of prefixes

a.. Et in tantis malis istis quam consolationem expectare poterant, quibus etiam cari sui consolationem non **ferunt**? (260A)

ferunt] conferunt Θ

b. Per Iacob et uirginem Iuda idem populus signatur. (265D).

signatur] designatur Θ

3. Correction

Simile quiddam in Euangelio **repperi**. (257C)

repperi] repperimus Θ

The first person plural appears far more natural for this type of writing than the first person singular. It is parallel to the use of 'dicimus', for example. Moreover, nowhere else in this commentary does Hugh use the first person singular. Two other examples of correction are discussed below.⁴¹⁶

⁴¹⁶ See ^P~~R~~ 252-5.

4. Addition of a sentence

Tribus modis homo a Deo derelinquitur. Aliquando intus et non foris, aliquando foris et non intus, aliquando et foris et intus. Foris et non intus derelictus fuit Iob, qui exterius flagella carnis sustinuit, sed intus constantiam mentis non amisit. Intus et non extra derelictus fuit Daud, cuius mentem intus sibi libido per consensum subdidit, sed prophetica foris admonitio ad penitentiam reuocauit. Intus et extra derelictus fuit prodigus ille in Euangelio filius, qui et luxuriose uiuens intus defluxit et fame tabescens, foris consolationem non inuenit. * Sed quos hoc modo Deus deserit, alios ad probationem deserit, ut per temptationem exerceantur, alios ad subuersionem deserit ut per temptationem deiciantur. (261A)

*Derelinquere autem dico ad temptandum concedere, quia nec diabolus ullatenus hominem temptare preualeret, nisi prius temptandi licentiam a Deo accepisset. Θ

I suspect this is a gloss which has become incorporated into the text. It does not seem to be in the style of Hugh, who does not use the first person 'dico' in this commentary. However, it could be a correct independent reading.

Re has the least errors of all the manuscripts belonging to this group. The witness *S* descends from it. The same cannot be said about the other manuscripts from this group, since there are a few points where these are right against *Re*.

i. Isti ergo propter afflictionem et **multitudinem seruitutis** migrant, quia dum passionibus iustorum communicare nolunt, a consortio iustorum alieni fiunt. (262B)

multitudinem ^{seruitutis}] miseriam suam *Re*

This is clearly a misreading of the abbreviation of 'm. s.' (for the words from Lamentations).

ii.

Sequitur: *Polluit regnum et principes eius*: hoc est uirginis Iuda. 'Polluit', dicit, propter gentes inter quas dispersi sunt. Ex quarum consortio et ritu profanati sunt, qui prius in Dei protectione securi regnabant et in principum suorum fortitudine confidebant. Nunc autem regnum totum cum principibus suis polluitur, quia populus cum **protectoribus** suis gentibus subiugatur. (266A)

protectoribus] rectoribus *Re*

The Troyes manuscripts share a number of errors that the witness from Rheims does not have.⁴¹⁷

•

1. Omissions, for example:

i. *Saut du même au même*:

a. Attendite quid dicat: *Cum deficeret*, inquit, *paruulus et lactans*. **In primis animaduertite discretionem. Plangit quod deficiunt, non plangit quod diuites non sunt. Quis? Paruulus, inquit, et lactans.** Videte quia infirmitati compatitur, non fortitudinem aut pompam ueneratur. (287A-B)

In primis animaduertite discretionem. Plangit quod deficiunt, non plangit quod diuites non sunt. Quis? *Paruulus*, inquit, *et lactans*.] *om. T1-3*

b. Sicut enim bonis congaudendo **eorum meritis participes fiunt, ita quoque malis per compassionem condolendo** de illorum perditione sibi lucrum faciunt. (286D)

eorum meritis participes fiunt ita quoque malis per compassionem condolendo] *om. T1-3*

⁴¹⁷ I have only been able to consult a few folios of *Li* (up to the end of the commentary on Lamentations 1). This limited collation groups it with the Troyes manuscripts.

ii. Single words:

a. Sed quia pro commissis condigna satisfactione semetipsos affligere, et cum Apostolo **corpus** castigare, et in seruitutem redigere nolunt... (263A)

corpus] *om. Li + T1-3*

b. Sic nimirum Samson ille erutis oculis ad molam ponitur, quia animus amisso lumine ueritatis per appetitum **terrenorum** desideriorum circumfertur. (263C)

terrenorum] *om. Li + T1-3*

c. *Reges eius et principes eius in gentibus*, subauditur, *constituit Deus*, ut scilicet **gentiles** regnent et principentur super eos. (281D)

gentiles] *om. T1-3*

2. Additions, for example:

...grauis animaduersio sequitur, quemadmodum cernimus quod quanto quis **attentius** ictum uibrat, tanto periculosius iaculatur. (280A)

attentius] *grauius attentius T1-3*

A manuscript from the following group (*M*) has ‘grauius’ instead of ‘attentius’ as an independent reading. Interestingly, this manuscript, which comes from Fontenay, shares with the Θ group the biblical citation discussed below.⁴¹⁸

⁴¹⁸ See below p.253.

General remarks on the Θ group

It is clear that *Re* is the most reliable witness of these Champagne manuscripts. As a whole, the group has only a handful of corruptions. It also includes evidence of emendation and probably represents, therefore, a later revision of the text.⁴¹⁹ It includes a sentence which is a debatable case. As we shall see, it does preserve the truth in one instance.⁴²⁰

⁴¹⁹ For further evidence that correction has taken place, see below pp. ~~253~~

⁴²⁰ See below p. ~~249~~.

v. Φ Group

s.xii

Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, 385 (Himmerod, Cistercian)	Ba
Bruges, Open.Bib., 153a (Ter Doest, Cistercian)	B
Charleville, Bibliothèque municipale, 166a (Signy, Cistercian)	C
Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 363 (Anchin, Benedictine)	D1
Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 364 (Marchiennes, Benedictine)	D2
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2912 (Beaupré, Cistercian)	P1
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 13416 (Vaucelles, Cistercian)	P4
Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 437 (Fécamp, Benedictine)	R1

s.xii^{ex}/xiiiⁱⁿ

Montpellier, Ecole de médecine, 413 (Fontenay, Cistercian)	M
--	---

s.xiii

Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 27 (Marchiennes, Benedictine)	D3
Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, 7.D.33 (Capistrano, Franciscan)	N
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 15256	P5
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 897 (Hereford, Franciscan)	O3
Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 551 (Jumièges, Benedictine)	R2

s.xiv

Washington, Library of Georgetown University, 12 (Flanders)	Wa
---	----

s.xiv/xv

Prague, University Library, 192 (Rosenberg Library, Bohemia)	Pr
--	----

S.XV

Edinburgh, University Library 70 (Flanders)	Eb
Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert I ^{er} , 2183 (1557-1604)	
(Bois-le-Duc, Carthusian)	Br2

This is a large group, comprising eight or nine witnesses dating from the twelfth century (of which three were possibly copied as early as the mid-twelfth century), five or six from the thirteenth century, one or two from the fourteenth century and two or three from the fifteenth century.

Most of the members of this set have provenances in Northern Europe, extending as far north as Ter Doest in Flanders and as far east as Himmerod near Trier. Four manuscripts attest to a wider diffusion outside this area: *M* comes from Burgundy, *N* from Abruzzo, *O3* from Hereford and *Pr* from Bohemia.

This version is not confined to a particular order. It was disseminated by Benedictines, Cistercians, Carthusians and Franciscans. It is worth noting, however, that in the twelfth century, Cistercian monasteries played a particularly important role in its diffusion. Some of these establishments were young:

Fontenay (Autun), f.1119, line of Clairvaux
Vaucelles (Cambrai), f. 1132, line of Clairvaux
Himmerod (Trier), f.1134
Beaupré (Beauvais), f. 1135, line of Clairvaux
Signy (Rheims), f. 1135, line of Clairvaux
Ter Doest (Tournai) f. 1176, line of Clairvaux

Φ¹ Sub-group

s.xii

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2912 (Beaupré, Cistercian) P1

Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 437 (Fécamp, Benedictine) R1

s.xiii

Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 551 (Jumièges, Benedictine) R2

This small subgroup is largely localized to the Normandy region, although the earliest manuscript comes from Beauvais. They share a particular feature with another Norman manuscript of a different group, namely *P2* from Foucarmont. For they preface *Super Lamentationes* with the same note explaining exactly what parts of Lamentations Hugh expounded: ‘Sciendum est quod in hoc uolumine non describit Magister Hugo nisi tres primas litteras primi alphabeti et secundum ex integro totum.’ This subgroup also shares with *P2* a remark which precedes the prologue to the exposition of Lamentations 2, and signals a change of chapter: ‘Hic incipit de secundo alphabeto.’⁴²¹

This subgroup is unique in its supplementation of Hugh’s text with four extracts on the significance of the Hebrew letters. Subgroups Φ² and Φ³ have two of these extracts, but not all four.

P1 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2912⁴²²

s.xii; Beaupré (diocese of Beauvais), Cistercian; Hugh; 80ff.; 210 x 135mm (150 x 90mm); single column of 24 lines; red, blue and yellow coloured initials; rubrication; dry-point marks in margin throughout.

⁴²¹ See above p.121. The opening part of *Super Lamentationes* has been excised in *R2*, so it cannot be known whether it also had the introductory note.

⁴²² *BN*, III, pp.271-2.

There are two twelfth-century *ex libris* for Beaupré, both of which are scored through with black ink. The first is on folio 1^v, the second follows the explicit of *Super Lamentationes* on folio 78^v: ‘Liber Sancte Marie * de Prato.’ Two fifteenth-century *ex libris* are added which indicate that the manuscript later belonged to a certain priest called Jacques of Laon. The first of these is also on folio 1^v (below the original *ex libris*): ‘Jacobus de Laon presbytorum minimus me possidet.’ The second is on folio 80: ‘Jacobus de Laon presbyt** me possidet.’

This little book is dedicated to *Super Lamentationes*. The commentary is preceded by Lamentations itself and some extracts, attributed to Jerome, on the significance of the Hebrew alphabet. The biblical text of Lamentations begins on folio 5^r. Before this, from folios 2^r to 3^r, there is a section from *De sermone Dei*. Despite the inclusion of this other text, there are palaeographical details which may indicate that this little manuscript was originally intended to contain solely *Super Lamentationes* (and its supplementations). *De sermone Dei* lacks a title and is incomplete, breaking off in mid-flow.⁴²³ It is followed by blank folios (from 3^v to 4^v). It is not written by the same scribe who copied the rest of *Pl*. Moreover, although there are twenty-four lines to the page and the measurements of the text-block are almost identical with those of folios 5 onwards, the prickings differ. From folios 1 to 12, there is a double set of prickings in the outer margin. But from folios 1 to 4, these are 11mm apart, whereas from 5 to 12 they are 4mm apart. Moreover, the four opening folios of the manuscript (1-4) share a scattering of little holes, which was possibly an original defect of the parchment. There are also two folios at the end of the manuscript which have similar flaws in the parchment. The final *ex libris* of Beaupré follows the commentary, thus marking the end of the book on folio 78^v.⁴²⁴ The presence of these folios at both the beginning and the end of *Pl* may suggest that they served as a cover to the work, a suitable use for blemished vellum.

The physical evidence, therefore, points to this little manuscript having originally contained *Super Lamentationes* and the related material on their own as

⁴²³ It ends with the words ‘Non facile est cogitationum qualitate discernere uel discutere’ (*PL* 177, col. 291C).

⁴²⁴ There are thirteenth- and possibly fourteenth-century verses added on folios 79^r to 80^r.

a unit. *Pl* and *Val* constitute two twelfth-century copies which were devoted to this one work, both of them small and portable (and both of them belonging to Cistercian communities).⁴²⁵ Certainly the rubrication in *Pl* indicates a unity of conception, with everything revolving around Lamentations:

- f.5^r **Incipiunt Lamentationes Ieremie prophete**
- f.11^v **Interpretatio Hebreorum elementorum secundum Ieronimum**
- f.12^r **Ieronimus ad Paulam de ‘Beati immaculati’**
- f.13^r **Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie**

The biblical text is complete, with all five chapters of Lamentations included. Moreover, the text is divided in a striking way. There is the expected use of red strokes through initials to indicate changes of verse. In addition, there are neat red contemporaneous notes in the margin at the following points:

Text	Margin
<i>Quomodo obtexit</i> etc. (= 2:1)	<i>conquestio</i>
<i>Cui comparabo te</i> etc. (=2:13)	<i>increpatio</i>
<i>Fecit Dominus</i> etc.(2:17)	<i>consolatio</i>
<i>Deduc quasi torrentem</i> etc. (2:mid-18)	<i>preceptio</i>
<i>Vide Domine et considera</i> etc. (2:20)	<i>deprecatio</i>
<i>Quos educaui et enutriui</i> etc. (2:22)	<i>Finit.</i>

These correspond with the five rhetorical divisions explicitly set out by Hugh in the prologue to Lamentations 2. Someone has, therefore, actually applied these

⁴²⁵On *Val* see above p.126.

categories to the biblical text. Moreover, at the end of Lamentations 2, we find the word ‘Finit’, an obvious reference to the fact that Hugh’s commentary ends at this point. Thus, for Lamentations 2, we find the biblical text actively read in the light of Hugh’s commentary. However, for Lamentations 1 there are no similar marginal notes to show where Hugh’s exposition ends.

The text of Lamentations is followed by a series of four extracts by, or attributed to, Jerome on the meaning of the Hebrew letters which structure the first four chapters of Lamentations.

1. The first excerpt is on folio 11^v. It is entitled ‘Interpretatio Hebreorum elementorum secundum Ieronimum’ and is taken from his letter to Paula on this very subject.⁴²⁶ In *Pl*, it is presented as a list of letters followed by their significance for easy reference. A few lines will illustrate the lay-out:

Aleph interpretatur Doctrina.
 Beth, Domus.
 Gimel, Plenitudo,
 Deleth, tabulatum (uel tabularum *s.l.*)
 etc.

As regards contents, it is virtually identical to Jerome’s enumeration. The few differences are:

	Jerome	<i>Pl</i>
LAMETH	‘disciplinae sive cordis’	‘Disciplina cordis’
PHE	‘os - ab ore, non ab osse intellege, ne litterarum ambiguitate fallaris’	‘oris, hic subauditur demonstratio’
RES	‘capitis’	‘capitis, subauditur intellectus’

⁴²⁶ See above p.26.

2. The list of letters and their meanings is immediately followed by a note which comes from the short commentary on Lamentations probably dating from the twelfth century and spuriously attributed to Jerome:⁴²⁷

Ieronimus: Admoneo te, o lector, ut quamuis aliam interpretationem istarum litterarum in aliis locis repperias, non ideo ista abicias, quia suis in locis propriam expositionem et sensum requirunt, ut coniungi possint sequentibus, sicut inuenitur in Psalmis a diuersis auctoribus esse expositum. Hoc in expositione Lamentationum Ieremie.

3. Following this note, on a new folio, is the rubric 'Ieronimus ad Paulam de *Beati immaculati*'. This introduces another excerpt, adapted for concision, from Jerome's letter to Paula, in which he is writing about Psalm 118 ('Beati immaculati' etc.). The focus of this extract in *PI* is the significance of each of the eight sequences of letters. This was the very passage which Paschasius used in the preface to his commentary on Lamentations 2, the work which in the twelfth century served as a source for the *Glossa ordinaria*.⁴²⁸

4. Below this further excerpt from Jerome is another enumeration of the significance of the individual Hebrew letters. The list applies directly to Psalm 118. The opening words of each verse of this text are placed first, the corresponding Hebrew letter comes next, to be followed by the meaning of the particular Hebrew letter. Here is an example of this presentation:

Beati immaculati. Aleph, id est doctrina.

In quo corriget. Beth, id est confusio.

Retribue. Gimel, id est retributio.

Adhesit. Deleth, id est timor.

etc.

⁴²⁷ See above footnote 94.

⁴²⁸ See above pp.30-1.

These are not the interpretations of Hebrew letters which Jerome presented as applying to Psalm 118, as well as to the other Psalms and to Lamentations.⁴²⁹ Perhaps the inclusion of alternative interpretations illustrates the remark on the preceding folio that Jerome's account of the significance of each letter is one among a number of possibilities. In fact, the different senses of the letters given here are those employed by Ambrose in his exposition of Psalm 118.

We have seen how the Hebrew letters and their significance concerned all the other commentators of Lamentations. In the twelfth century, the commentators adopted Jerome's formula, via Paschasius. Guibert of Nogent was an exception in his use of the alternative interpretations of the letters, at least for Lamentations 1. Hugh, as we have already remarked, was unique in neglecting them. To preface *Super Lamentationes* with extracts on the very topic Hugh overlooked suggests that his innovation was not universally welcomed. It implies that the significance of the Hebrew letters was perceived, at least by some, as an organic part of any commentary on Lamentations.

R1 Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 437⁴³⁰

s.xii; Fécamp, Benedictine; Ambrose, Augustine and Hugh; 328ff.; 260 x 160mm; single column of 27 lines; red, blue, green and gold coloured initials; rubrication; composite: measurements of text-block for ff.1-250 (Ambrose): 190 x 100mm; for ff.251-265 (Augustine): 192 x 103mm; for ff.266-328 (Hugh): 195 x 100mm; prickings on ff.266-281 visible further in the outer margin than before; ff.1-265 (Ambrose + Augustine): ruled in plummet; f.266 onwards: ruled in dry-point; quire signatures up to f.240^v (30 quires of 8); empty folios: 248^v-249^v (after Ambrose); 265^v (after Augustine).

The issue of whether *R1* is a unitary or composite manuscript is of consequence. For the first text it contains is the above-mentioned exposition of Psalm 118 by Ambrose. The physical evidence of the manuscript would indicate that the different texts were copied as separate enterprises, and brought together afterwards. Even so, it seems likely that a conscious choice was made to join

⁴²⁹ See above p.32.

⁴³⁰ CG, I, p.86.

Hugh's text, along with the supplementary material, to Ambrose's commentary, although Augustine's fourth sermon on Jacob and Esau is placed between them.

R1 is a Benedictine copy from Fécamp in the diocese of Rouen. It is, without a doubt, very closely related to *P1*, which came from the Cistercian centre at Beaupré in the diocese of Beauvais. At first sight, it would appear that the former directly descended from the latter. There is evidence, however, that both manuscripts were copied from the same exemplar. In what follows, I will set forth evidence for establishing their closeness (in addition to that of shared errors given below),⁴³¹ while drawing attention to differences.

Both *P1* and *R1* share exactly the same portion of *De sermone Dei*. In the case of *P1*, the treatise comes before *Super Lamentationes*; in the case of *R1*, it follows it. If *R1* is composite, then *Super Lamentationes* would originally have been copied with this text alone, as is the case in *P1*. In both, *De sermone Dei* is incomplete, breaking off in mid-sentence at the same point. *P1*, however, ends with the two infinitives 'discernere uel discutere', whereas *R1* only has 'discutere'. Unlike *P1*, *R1* has a rubric for this work: 'Incipit expositio eiusdem super illo uersiculo Apostoli: *Unus est sermo Dei* etc.'

Both manuscripts include the biblical text of Lamentations under the title 'Incipiunt Lamentationes Ieremie'. *P1* contains all five chapters, whereas *R1* just has two. The former, we should remember, had the marginal heading 'Finit' at the end of Lamentations 2 to mark the point at which Hugh's exposition ends. It is conceivable that such a note prompted the copyist of *R1* to transcribe only these two chapters. Furthermore, the latter incorporates the rhetorical categories, 'conquestio', 'increpatio' etc., at the appropriate places within the text of Lamentations. In *P1*, they are written neatly and clearly in the margin. It could be presumed that weaving them actually into the text-block was a progression from marginal notes and not vice versa.

These two manuscripts also have very similar extracts following the biblical text, with only small differences, as follows:

⁴³¹ See below pp.230-1.

1. *R1* has an abbreviated version of the rubric which comes before the first of these extracts in *P1*:

P1 ‘Interpretatio Hebreorum elementorum secundum Ieronimum’

R1 ‘De interpretationibus litterarum’

2. The first extract after Lamentations, which concerns the Hebrew letters and their significance, is set out in a list in *P1*, whereas it is presented on continuous lines in *R1*, perhaps to spare parchment.

3. *R1* makes a mistake in this first extract:

P1 Lameth: Disciplina cordis.

R1 Lameth: disciplina patris.

4. In the second extract, *R1* has another error not shared by *P1*:

P1 ‘a diuersis auctoribus’

R1 ‘a diuersis actoribus’

5. Before the third excerpt, *R1* omits the title ‘Ieronimus ad Paulam de *Beati immaculati*’.

6. At the end of the fourth piece, *R1* leaves out part of the definition of the Hebrew letter ‘thav’ for the final verse of Psalm 118:

P1 ‘*Appropinquet* (Ps.118:169). THAV. id est Consummauit uel errauit’

R1 ‘*Appropinquet*. THAV. id est consummauit’

Before the title to *Super Lamentationes*, both witnesses have the same introductory note on the limited nature of this commentary. They also share the later pointer to the start of the section concerned with Lamentations 2. They do not, however, use the same term to describe the work. *P1* refers to it as 'tractatus', *R1* as 'expositio'.

Another small but significant difference between these two witnesses is the way in which the commentary is divided. Although *P1* has a red note in the text-block to mark the start of Hugh's treatment of Lamentations 2, the initial of 'Medicus' is not distinguished by size or colour. Nor is the letter 'Q' for the 'Quomodo' (which opens both the literal and allegorical exposition of 2:1ff.) any different from other capitals. It is presented simply as continuation of the text. *R1*, on the other hand, makes use of *litterae notabiliores* for the 'M' of 'Medicus' and the 'Q' of the 'Quomodo' at the start of the allegorical exposition of 2:1.

For the commentary on Lamentations 1, *R1* employs a number of headings in the margin (for the allegorical and moral interpretation of 1:1, the moral interpretation of 1:2, and the historical and allegorical interpretations of 1:3). *P1* just has coloured initials in the margin at certain points ('h', 'a' and 'm' throughout 1:1 and 1:2, 'h' and 'a' for 1:3). Both witnesses have the word 'Moraliter' embedded in the text-block before the moral interpretation of 1:3, as occurs in manuscripts from other groups.

R2 Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 551⁴³²

s.xiii; Jumièges, Benedictine; miscellany: *Martyrology of Usuard*, Hugh, Augustine, Jerome; 200ff.; 240 x 165mm; 2 columns.

On folio 2^r, there is a table of contents which includes a reference to a work of Hugh's which has not survived: 'Cronica uenerandi Hugonis Parisiensis.' A fifteenth- or sixteenth-century note mentions that the *Chronicon* was removed from this manuscript to be bound up with another which is now lost. *R2* originally

⁴³² CG, I, pp.127-28.

contained, therefore, three works by Hugh: the *Chronicon*, *Super Lamentationes* and *In Ecclesiasten*.

Folio 4^r opens with the end of Lamentations 1, breaking off in the middle of 1:22: ‘eorum coram te et de te uindemia eorum sicut uindemiasti me propter...’ Therefore, *R2* only included Lamentations 1, whereas *P1* has all five chapters and *R1* the first two.

R2 shares the four excerpts from Jerome and Pseudo-Jerome, inheriting the rubrics of *R1*. It also has the same error in the second extract: ‘a diuersis actoribus’ instead of ‘et diuersis auctoribus’. The evidence would lead one to conclude, therefore, that *R2* descended from *R1*.⁴³³ They have another text in common, Augustine’s fourth sermon, *De Iacob et Esau*. The modern editor of this work has found them to be closely related.⁴³⁴

Φ² Sub-group.

s.xii

Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 363 (Anchin, Benedictine)	D1
Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 364 (Marchiennes, Benedictine)	D2

s.xiii

Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 27 (Marchiennes, Benedictine)	D3
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 897 (Hereford, Franciscan)	O3
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 15256	P5

Three of the five extant manuscripts belonging to this subgroup come from North-East France. Two of these are early witnesses, dating from the mid-twelfth century. From these descend the thirteenth-century copies of this subgroup, so it

⁴³³ I have had little opportunity to consult *R2* sufficiently.
⁴³⁴ Augustine, *Sermones*, ed. C. Lambot, CCSL 41 (Turnhout, 1961)

was from this locality that the Φ^2 version was diffused further afield, reaching as far as Hereford in the west of England. It figured too in the university milieu of Paris and was later housed in the library of the Sorbonne. Both the manuscripts which travelled belonged to thirteenth-century friars, one to Franciscans, the other to Dominicans.

The twelfth-century witnesses can be grouped among a number of collections of Hugh's works copied during the twelfth century at the two Benedictine abbeys of Anchin and Marchiennes.⁴³⁵ These collections are to a certain extent complementary, though some texts are duplicated; *Super Lamentationes* is one such text. This series of twelfth-century manuscripts devoted to texts by Hugh suggests a concerted effort to gather Hugh's *oeuvre*, akin to the project which Gilduin instigated at St Victor during the 1140s.⁴³⁶ Most probably, one of the abbeys provided the other with the texts of Hugh, or there was an exchange.

Anchin and Marchiennes had active scriptoria. Copying was promoted at the former, in particular, under the abbacy of Goswin (abbot from 1130 to 1165).⁴³⁷ He had studied at Paris, under Abelard for a time, so may have come into contact with Hugh's writings and teachings while there.

The Anchin and Marchiennes copies of Hugh's works may well represent a Benedictine enterprise to collect his *oeuvre*. It would be interesting to investigate which institution might have provided one or both of these abbeys with exemplars. The line of inquiry that is worth exploring is whether this version reached Anchin or Marchiennes from Paris or via Normandy. Anchin notably had links with St Denis on the outskirts of Paris, and Bec in Normandy.⁴³⁸ Certainly two twelfth-century representatives of the Φ^2 subgroup share certain features with the Norman manuscript *P1*, most notably the presence of all five chapters of Lamentations preceding the commentary. *D1* and *D2* also include the first two

⁴³⁵ These are manuscripts 359-366 of the municipal library of Douai, the odd numbers copied at Anchin, and the even at Marchiennes.

⁴³⁶ See Baron, 'L'Authenticité de l'oeuvre', 182.

⁴³⁷ *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastique*, ed. R. Aubert, (Paris, 1984), XXI, col. 846: 'Une des manifestations de la prospérité d'Anchin sous l'abbatit de Gossuin fut l'essor extraordinaire de son *scriptorium*.'

⁴³⁸ On its links with Bec, see below p. 259-60.

pieces on the significance of the Hebrew alphabet, one being Jerome's enumeration of the meaning of each letter, the other the note falsely attributed to Jerome on the fact that this is just one among a number of interpretations of the alphabet. These two extracts are also reproduced in two other manuscripts from the north, *B* and *C* of the Φ^3 group.

D1 Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 363⁴³⁹

s.xii; Anchin (diocese of Arras), Benedictine; collection of works by Hugh; 188ff.; 325 x 220mm (240 x 164 mm); composite; ff.1-118: 2 columns of 40 lines; ff.119 onwards: 2 columns of 36 lines; red, blue and green coloured initials.

D1 dates from the mid-twelfth century, therefore representing an early witness. On folio 2^r, there are epitaphs to four different figures. The left-hand column contains an epitaph to Goswin, with the following rubric: '*Epitaphium Domini Gozuini abbatis*.'

The rest of the column is left empty. In the right-hand column, there are further epitaphs, the first of which is dedicated to Alvisus, the abbot of Anchin before 1112, who later became bishop of Arras. It bears the rubric: *Epitaphium domini Aluisi episcopi Atrebatensis*. There follows an epitaph for an abbot whose name was Leo: *Epitaphium domini Leonis abbatis*. Finally, there are three extracts concerning Hugh himself:

Versus de domino Hugone.

'Fons diuinarum magnus defecit aquarum.

O fons plangendus quia iam non inueniendus.

Semper inest animo fons lucidus et sine limo.

Qui dum manabat multorum corda rigabat.

Fons est siccatus sapiens Hugo tumulatus.

Pro quo nunc orent eius qui dogmate florent.'

'Anno ab incarnatione Domini mcxli / (obiit) Dominus Hugo canonicus Sancti Victoris iii idus Februarie / qui ex Ipprensi territorio ortus a puero exulauit et hec et plura alia sui operis emolumenta reliquit.'

⁴³⁹ CG, IV, pp.196-97.

Epitaphium Magistri Hugonis theologi.

‘Dormit in hoc tumulo doctor celeberrimus Hugo.

Quam brevis eximium continet urna uirum.

Doctor preclarus, nullique secundus in orbe,

Claruit ingenio, moribus, ore, stilo.’

If the epitaphs on folio 2^r are contemporary with the rest of the manuscript, Goswin’s death in 1165 represents the ‘terminus post quem’ for its copying. They are written in different hands, all dating from the twelfth century. But none of these hands reappear in the actual texts copied in this manuscript. It would seem, therefore, highly probable that they were added subsequently.

It would be interesting to know why these epitaphs are included here and, in particular, why there are verses on Hugh. At least two of the figures have important associations with Anchin. But it is not clear what connection Hugh has with either them or this institution. Perhaps the belief expressed in the note that Hugh was born at Ypres in Flanders, and thus not very far from Anchin, accounts for the verses on his death following those of regional figures. Whatever the case, it is an unusual alliance, as though Hugh was being adopted into the world of this institution and its environs. Conceivably, the monks at Anchin associated Hugh with Goswin, because of the latter’s involvement in the copying of Hugh’s works. *D1* is after all one such collection.

Here follows its scheme:

f.2^{va} ***Incipit liber Magistri Hugonis de sacramentis minor*** (= *Summa sententiarum*)

f.52^{vb} ***Explicit liber de sacramentis. Incipit prologus Magistri Hugonis in libro qui dicitur Didascalicon***

f.53^{ra} ***Incipit liber Didascalicon Magistri Hugonis*** (rubric at bottom of f.52^{vb})

f.78^{vb} ***Explicit Didascalicon Magistri Hugonis***

f.79^{ra} Lamentations I-V

f.81^{va} *Ieronimus* (two extracts on the significance of the Hebrew letters, one by Jerome, the other attributed to him)

f.81^{vb} *Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie*

f.106^{ra} *Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis de tribus diebus*

f.119^{va} *Incipit expositio Magistri Hugonis super Dionysium Ariopagitam de tribus Hierarchiis*

This last work, which is followed by a correspondence between Hilduin, abbot of Saint-Denis, and Louis VII, was added later in the twelfth century. *DI* is, therefore, a composite manuscript.

Super Lamentationes is sandwiched between two highly diffused works, the *Didascalicon* and *De tribus diebus*. As in *PI*, the text of Lamentations is copied in full. Unlike *PI*, however, there is no rubric, only space left for it. Another similarity is the listing of Hebrew letters and their meanings, though *DI* does not give this enumeration a title, just an ascription in red and green capitals: 'IERONIMUS.' This is repeated before the note falsely attributed to Jerome which follows this list. The two extracts on the Hebrew letters are set out in the left-hand column of folio 81^v; the commentary begins in the right-hand margin. The rubric is written in green, blue and red capitals, the colours alternated, thus distinguishing it clearly from the biblical text and excerpts which preface it.

The whole exposition is presented in sections. Colour, *litterae notabiliores* and sense headings are used throughout to articulate the text. The initials of lemmata are coloured in red, green or blue. The first letter of a new verse is larger than other initials within the text. Sense headings are added in red, generally in the space left for them in the line before the start of the new lemma. Thus, the copyist left room for a rubricator to write them in; we can surmise that either he had an exemplar with clear divisions or he consciously imposed them himself.

D2 Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 364⁴⁴⁰

s.xii; Marchiennes (diocese of Cambrai-Arras), Benedictine; collection of works by Hugh; 135 ff.; 340 x 220mm (250 x 160mm); 2 columns of 35 lines; red, blue and green coloured initials.

On folio 135 there is an *ex libris* from the abbey of Marchiennes: 'Liber Sancte Rictrudis.'⁴⁴¹

D2 is another collection of Hugh's works, followed at the end by appended material, such as a letter from Baldwin, Count of Flanders and briefly Latin emperor of Constantinople (1204-6), which gives a 'terminus post quem' for these later additions of 1204. The texts by Hugh contained in the manuscript are as follows:

f.2^{va} **Incipit liber minor Magistri Hugonis de sacramentis** (preceded by 'capitula' of this work on f.1^{va} up to this rubric)

f.50^{va} **Incipiunt Lamentationes Ieremie**

f.53^r (extracts on the significance of the Hebrew letters attributed to Jerome)

Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie

f.85^{ra} **Incipit liber primus Magistri Hugonis de uanitate mundi**

f.103^{vb} **Tractatus eiusdem de tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum, id est personis, locis, temporibus (= *Chronicon*)**

Thus, *D1* and *D2* have two texts in common, . *Summa sententiarum* and *Super Lamentationes*. The former, furthermore, is at the beginning of the manuscript in both. *D2*, however, precedes this work with a chapter list for it. A further difference is that *D2* gives the biblical text of Lamentations the heading, 'Incipiunt Lamentationes Ieremie', whereas *D1* merely leaves space for this to be added later. *D2* does not, however, share with *D1* the title 'Ieronimus' before the enumeration of Hebrew letters, which it sets out in two lists.

⁴⁴⁰ CG, IV, p.197.

⁴⁴¹ I do not know the date of this *ex libris*.

The rubric for the commentary is the same as that in *D1*, but is less decorative, red being the only colour used. The initial which opens the commentary is less ornate. Nonetheless, colour is used throughout to distinguish the text into sections.

Despite the textual similarities, there are two marked differences which will be discussed below.⁴⁴²

D3 Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 27⁴⁴³

s.xiii; Marchiennes (diocese of Cambrai-Arras), Benedictine; miscellaneous collection: *Glossa ordinaria* (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs), Hugh, Lanfranc, Yves of Chartres, Guibert of Nogent; ff.121; 230 x 160mm; 26-40 lines.

This manuscript is incomplete, as is clear from a contents list on the first folio. Among the other texts it includes is one that is directly relevant to biblical exegesis, entitled 'Item differentia inter historiam, allegoriam, anagogem et tropologiam'.

After the biblical glosses of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs, comes a glossed Lamentations which incorporates Hugh's commentary. Another biblical gloss is added in the columns around the biblical text. The biblical text itself has interlinear glosses, each gloss corresponding to the relevant verses on the page, right up to the end of Lamentations.⁴⁴⁴ Hugh's commentary is added in columns throughout this glossed text, even though, given its length, it fails to correspond to the biblical text on the page. As Hugh's commentary is longer than the glossed text, it continues after the glossed Lamentations has ended (set out in a normal *mise-en-page* of two columns).

This juxtaposition of *Super Lamentationes* with a glossed Lamentations is striking. Such a presentation has scholastic associations, possibly suggesting that Hugh's commentary was used in the class-room.⁴⁴⁵

⁴⁴² See below pp. 253 and 256.

⁴⁴³ CG, IV, pp. 17-18.

⁴⁴⁴ Both the interlinear and marginal glosses may come from the *Glossa ordinaria* of Gilbert the Universal. I was unable to check this.

⁴⁴⁵ See below p.270.

P5 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 15256⁴⁴⁶

s.xiii; miscellaneous works; 310ff.; large format; 2 columns of 51 lines; decorated initials; red underlining and touching up of letters.

On folio 1^v, there is a thirteenth-century table of contents.

It came into the possession of the Sorbonne Library, as revealed by the stamp on folio 2^r.

The manuscript may well come from a scholastic milieu. The texts it contains are reminiscent of *lectio diuina* of the schools: *sententie* on the Bible, a *distinctio capitulorum*, an *expositio* of difficult words in the Bible, a ^{preacher's handbook} and a work entitled in the list of contents *Concordantie quedam reales*. There are also works by Augustine including his *De Genesi ad litteram*. The two works by Hugh are the *Didascalicon*, at home in this educational setting, followed by *Super Lamentationes* ^(ff. 146^v-168^{va}) which is called an 'expositio' in the list of contents, but has the same title as *D1* and *D2* above: 'Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie.'

P5 is possibly a direct descendant of *D1*.⁴⁴⁷ It shares all of its errors and peculiar readings, with one exception which can be explained as a correction. It also shares the clear presentation of the exposition, with the added feature of underlining in red to distinguish the lemma, a characteristic both of its time and educational context.

⁴⁴⁶ L. Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits de la Sorbonne conservés à la Bibliothèque Impériale sous les numéros 15176-16718 du fonds latins* (Paris, 1870), IV, p.3.

⁴⁴⁷ This is also the case for the text of the *Didascalicon*, according to Buttner, intro., p.Xlv

O3 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley, 897⁴⁴⁸

s.xiii; Franciscan house at Hereford; Hugh of Fouilloy, a *distinctio*, William of Lincoln and a unattributed commentary on Lamentations 1-5; 133 ff.; 320 x 220mm (245 x 150mm); 2 columns of 52-57 lines; coloured initials.

According to M. R. James, there is no evidence that the extant manuscripts which belonged to Grey Friars of Hereford were copied by or for them.⁴⁴⁹

The first work in O3 is Hugh of Fouilloy's *De claustro anime*, which is given the following rubric: 'Incipit prologus Domini Hugonis de Fouilloy in libro primo de eo quod nocet mundo renunciare uolentibus ... De claustro anime.' This is followed by two different works which fall into the category of 'numerales', the second of which is ascribed to 'Willelmus de Montibus' (here referred to as Chancellor of Lincoln). All three works have full titles. The commentary on Lamentations, however, has simply the following:

f.121^r **Ieremias: Aleph. Quo<modo> sedet sola ciuitas. Hugo de Sancto Victore**

The text is an abridgement of Hugh's commentary, interspersed with extracts from some other source or sources on Lamentations.⁴⁵⁰ Where Hugh's commentary is excerpted, his name, usually in abbreviated form, is indicated in red. The alternative expositor (or expositors) obviously deal with those parts neglected by Hugh; they also treat some of the verses Hugh himself expounded. In fact, Hugh's own commentary ceases to be a source from the interpretation of 2:6 onwards.

It is surprising that this version travelled as far as Hereford. Perhaps it bears witness to the itinerant nature of Franciscan life. It may be the case that a friar brought a copy of a Φ^2 manuscript back from Paris. Interestingly, it comes to

⁴⁴⁸ Madran et al., *A Summary Catalogue*, V, p.384.

⁴⁴⁹ M. R. James, 'The Library of the Grey Friars of Hereford', in A. G. Little et al. (eds) *Collectanea Franciscana* (Aberdeen, 1914), I, p.122.

⁴⁵⁰ I have as yet to identify these sources.

a region which already has circulating its own distinctive version of this commentary, as exemplified by *E*, *H* and *W* above.⁴⁵¹

Φ³ Subgroup

s.xii

Bruges, Openbare Bibliotheek, 153 (Ter Doest, Cistercian)	B
Charleville, Bibliothèque municipale, 166a (Signy, Cistercian)	C

A prominent similarity between these two manuscripts is that they both include the text of Lamentations 1-4. The absence of the fifth chapter sets them apart from *P1*, *D1* and *D2* above. There can be no doubt that they are related to these two subgroups, both because of the presence of the biblical text and also through the addition of extracts on the significance of the Hebrew letters. They contain only the two excerpts found in the Φ² twelfth-century witnesses, and not the four of the Φ¹ set.

B Bruges, Openbare Bibliotheek, 153⁴⁵²

s.xii; Ter Doest (diocese of Tournai), Cistercian; collection of works by Hugh; 145ff.; 314 x 216mm; 2 columns of 27 lines; composite.

The manuscript contains an *ex libris* which dates either from the twelfth or the thirteenth century: ‘Liber Sancte Marie de Tholan.’ The script of the first volume, 153a, is no earlier than the late twelfth century. *B* is two manuscripts bound together. Volume one, numbering ninety-one folios, contains first *Super*

⁴⁵¹ See above pp.137-44.
⁴⁵² *Catalogue général des manuscrits des Bibliothèques de Belgique*. II, pp.194-7.

Lamentationes, followed by numerous shorter pieces (an asterisk denotes a text which has not been identified or - published):⁴⁵³

- f.1^{va} Lamentations 1-4
 - f.6^r *Tractatus Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie*
 - f.56^{va} *Liber quattuor questionum de preuaricatione prima**
 - f.66^{vb} *De quadripartito iudicio Dei* (*Miscellanea*, 1.169).
 - f.68^{rb} *De tribus silentiis et cursu diei* (= *De uerbo incarnato*, *Collatio* I)
 - f.70^{ra} *De triplici pace hominis* (*Misc.* 1:6)
 - f.70^{vb} *De sapientia Dei**
 - f.74^{va} *De terra anime et celo eius**
 - f.75^{va} *Item sententie eiusdem de uerbis Euangelii**
 - f.77^{va} (Inc: 'Lectionem esse incipientium opus perfectorum')
 - f.78^{rb} *De quattuor gradibus**
 - f.79^{vb} *De trinitate**
 - f.83^{ra} (Inc. 'Hoc in uno quoque agitur quod in Moyse et Maria consideratur')
 - f.83^{rb} *De exilio**
 - f.83^{va} *De musica**
 - f.84^{ra} (Inc. *Arithmetica igitur est numerorum scientia**)
 - f.84^{rb} (Inc. *Congruum professioni quam Deo inspirante**)
- Audite me diuine fructus*

There is a marginal note in the biblical text which shows that a thirteenth-century reader was aware that Hugh's commentary only covered some of the text. At Lamentations 1:4 there is the following remark: 'Ab hinc uacat expositio usque ad capitulum secundum.'

Hugh's *Super Lamentationes* is not presented with the clear divisions found in the Φ^2 subgroup above. There is little use of colour and sense headings occur only occasionally in the margin.

⁴⁵³ For the full contents of the second volume, 153b, see O. Lottin, *Quelques recueils d'écrits attribués à Hugues de Saint-Victor*, *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 25 (1958), 248-284.

C Charleville, Bibliothèque municipale, 166a⁴⁵⁴

s.xii; Signy (diocese of Reims), Cistercian; collection of works by Hugh; 149ff.; 350 x 225mm (235 x 165mm; ruling pattern = 230 x 165mm); 2 columns of 34 lines; red, blue and green initials, *manchettes* and rubrication.

There is a late *ex libris* on folio 1, which possibly dates from the sixteenth century: 'Liber Signiaci Sancte Marie.' Like *B*, the whole manuscript is devoted to works by Hugh, as follows:

f.1^{ra} *Incipit liber Magistri Hugonis Parisiensis de archa Noe*

f.36^{va} *Explicit liber Magistri Hugonis Parisiensis de archa Noe.*

Incipit eiusdem expositio super prologum beati Ieronimi in Pentateuchum

f.37^{vb} *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris* (to end of Chapter 17)

f.43^{vb} *De nuncupatione Genesis* (= *Notule* 2; the following chapters are also copied up to the end of Chapter 13 on Leviticus)

f.65^{ra} *Incipit prologus sequentis operis, id est libri Didascalicon Hugonis Parisiensis*

f.65^{vb} *Incipit liber Didascalicon Hugonis Parisiensis diuisus in duas partes quarum unaquaque tres habet distinctiones*

f.99^{ra} *Incipit liber Hugonis Parisiensis de tribus diebus*

f.112^{ra} *Finit opusculum Magistri Hugonis* (followed by the two extracts on the significance of the Hebrew letters)

f.112^{rb} Lamentations 1-4

f.115^{ra} *Incipit expositio Magistri Hugonis Parisiensis super Lamentationes Ieremie.*

C is unique among the extant manuscripts which contain *Super Lamentationes*, for it alone includes with this work the exegetical *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris*, though not in its entirety, as well as part of Hugh's *Notule super*

⁴⁵⁴ CG, V, pp.617-18.

Pentateuch^{um}⁴⁵⁵ The presence of the *Didascalicon* emphasizes the exegetical focus of the manuscript. This may explain why the term ‘expositio’ is applied to the commentary. The same word is used for Hugh’s interpretation of Jerome’s prologue to the Pentateuch.

The placing of the extracts on the significance of the Hebrew letters before the text of Lamentations is peculiar to C. Another particularity is the note between the end of Hugh’s exposition of Lamentations 1 and the prologue for the second Lamentation: ‘Finit de primo threno. Incipit de secundo quem totum ex integro exponit.’ This is possibly connected with the Φ^1 subgroup, where a note precedes the commentary in which the words ‘totum ex integro’ occur. Before the prologue to Lamentations 2, this subgroup has the note: ‘Hic incipit de secundo alphabeto.’

Coloured initials (or touched up initials) and marginal sense headings further divide the text into clear sections. A few of the headings are worth highlighting, as they bear witness to a certain confusion in the twelfth century about which sense was being expounded at particular points. Thus at the start of Hugh’s allegorical treatment of 2:1 onwards (which follows the literal interpretation of 2:1-9), C has ‘Mor<aliter>’ in the margin (270A). As discussed above, the theme here actually spans the allegorical and tropological realms, since it is concerned with the effects of the Fall on man’s soul.

At the change of tack in the exposition of 2:5, where Hugh begins to speak of how the destruction of Jerusalem represents God’s rejection of the Jewish people, C places ‘Hist<orice>’ in the margin (274C), whereas further on, beside the words ‘Supra de excecatione Iudeorum’ which opens the allegorical interpretation of 2:7, C has ‘Allegor<ice>’ (277A).

There is one final instance of a notable sense heading. On 2:11, where the order of expositions is inverted with the result that the allegorical interpretation comes first, C rightly has Hist<orice> where the literal sense begins (286C). Thus, some thought has clearly gone into the choice of sense heading, either in C or in

⁴⁵⁵ C^{ol} above contained parts of these works, but they were added later in a thirteenth-century hand.

its exemplar. *B*, we will recall, has just a few sense headings for only a small part of the commentary.

Φ⁴ Subgroup

s.xii

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat.13416 (Vaucelles, Cistercian) P4

s.xiii

Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, 385 (Himmerod, Cistercian) Ba

s.xiv/xv

Prague, Univ. Lib., 192 (Rosenberg Library, Bohemia) Pr

Washington, Library of Georgetown University 12
(France or Flanders) Wa

s.xv

Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert I^{er}, 2183 (1557-1604)
(Bois-le-duc, Carthusian) Br1

Edinburgh, University Library, 70 (Flanders) Eb

There are no extant witnesses in the Φ⁴ subgroup which predate the late twelfth century. The manuscripts come from Northern Europe, although one later copy belonging to this subgroup is to be found in Bohemia. The two earliest copies are from Vaucelles in Northern France and Himmerod near Trier. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, there are at least two witnesses in Flanders.

All these manuscripts contain texts by a variety of authors, so none can be considered a collection of works by Hugh. *Br*, *Pr* and *Wa* do include works by Hugh other than *Super Lamentationes*, but among a whole miscellany of other medieval authors. *Eb* joins *Super Lamentationes* to a work by Richard of St Victor. *P4*, probably a composite manuscript, has it following Guibert of Nogent's commentary on the Minor Prophets which includes his own exposition of Lamentations. *Ba*, also composite, contains two other works which are not related in any way to Hugh's commentary.

P4 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 13416⁴⁵⁶

s.xii; Vaucelles (diocese of Cambrai), Cistercian; 2 works: Guibert of Nogent and Hugh of St Victor; 163ff.; composite: approximately 250 x 170mm (Guibert: 175 x 110mm; Hugh: 175 x 116mm); single column of 27 lines (slight differences in ruling pattern between the two works); quire signatures for Guibert: Roman numerals on the recto; green and red decorated initials more often in Guibert than in Hugh; red touching up of letters and rubrication.

There is an *ex libris* on folio 163^v which dates from the twelfth or thirteenth century: 'Liber Sancte Marie de Valcellis.' Later, *P4* belonged to the Benedictines of St Germain, since on folio 1^r there is in a post-medieval hand '*ex libris Bibliothecae communitatis Congregationis Sancti Benedicti*', and further down 'Sancti Germani abbatis'.

The two works of exegesis were bound together, probably before the sixteenth century. The binding seems to be medieval. As discussed above, Guibert's *Tropologie in prophetis* includes an exposition of Lamentations.⁴⁵⁷ This may offer a reason for why these two texts were put together.

Super Lamentationes is not described as a *tractatus* or an *expositio*. The title simply states the author and the text expounded:

f.119^r-163^v ***Magister Hugo super Lamentationes Ieremie***

⁴⁵⁶ Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits*, II, p.230.

⁴⁵⁷ See above pp.31-2.

The commentary is clearly presented. Alternating red and green initials signal lemmata. There is one main division in the work. A *littera notabilior* for the 'M' of 'Medicus' at the opening of the prologue to Lamentations 2 marks this as the significant break in the work. There are marginal sense headings, although employed inconsistently.

Ba **Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, 385**⁴⁵⁸

s.xiii; Himmerod (diocese of Trier), Cistercian; composite; three works: William of St Thierry, Jacques de Vitry, Hugh; 139ff., 320 x 220mm; 30 lines; multiple hands.

There is the following *ex libris* on folios 1^r, 71^v and 139^r: 'Liber monachorum Sancte Marie de Himmerode.'

Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie (f.98^{ra}-139^{rb})

There is no clear division in the commentary. The exposition of Lamentations 1 simply runs into that of the second chapter, without any *litterae notabiliores* marking a break. There is, however, an abbreviation for 'Chapter 2' next to the allegorical interpretation of 2:1.

Sense headings in the margin were probably added later.

Wa **Washington, Library of Georgetown University, 12**⁴⁵⁹

s.xiv/xv (c. 1320?);⁴⁶⁰ France or Flanders; miscellaneous works: Bede, Jerome, Hugh, Gilbert the Universal, Hugh of Fouilloy; paper; 301ff.; 290 x 210mm; illuminated initial for each separate work.

⁴⁵⁸ S. de Ricci and W. J. Wilson, *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (New York, 1935), I, p.820.

⁴⁵⁹ De Ricci and Wilson, *Census*, Supplement. (New York, 1962), pp.109-10.

⁴⁶⁰ This date is conjectured in a modern note of *Wa* on the flyleaf.

The manuscript is dominated by exegetical texts, opening with Bede on Proverbs followed by Jerome on Ecclesiastes and then Bede again on the Song of Songs. There are also twelfth-century works of exegesis: Hugh's own exposition of Ecclesiastes and two commentaries on Lamentations, the first being Hugh's *Super Lamentationes*, the second being the *Glossa ordinaria* compiled by Gilbert the Universal. Interestingly, Hugh's commentary is immediately followed by Jerome's letter to Paula (here wrongly described as being to Marcella) in which he expounds the meaning of the Hebrew letters.

Besides these extended texts, there are short pieces of biblical interpretation by Hugh. Thus, the manuscript has for the most part a Scriptural focus.

The works in the manuscript by Hugh (or attributed to him) are as follows:

f.139^r *In Ecclesiasten*

f.198^v 'Currebant duo simul et illius discipulus'... 'nouus homo resurgat, amen';

f.199^v *De uerbo incarnato, Collatio I*

f.201^r-228^r *Tractatus Magistri Hugonis de Sancto Victore super Lamentationes Ieremie prophete*

f.275^v 282^v *De laude patrum*⁴⁶¹

Both Hugh of Fouilloy's *De columba deargentata* and part of the second book of *De clauastro anime* also figure, possibly attributed to Hugh.

Super Lamentationes is divided into clear sections. Lemmata are underlined and the initial of a new verse is often a *littera notabilior*. Sense headings are placed throughout within the text block.

⁴⁶¹ I have not yet identified what this work is.

Eb Edinburgh, University Library, 70⁴⁶²

s.xv; Flanders (?); Hugh and Richard; 184ff.; 145 x 95mm; 25 lines; blue and red initials.

This small volume is clearly a *de luxe* manuscript, written in an ornate gothic bookhand. According to the catalogue, the script dates from the late fifteenth century and is either Flemish or French, the penwork ornament suggesting the former.

It contains just two works:

f.1^r **Commentum Magistri Hugonis de Sancto Victore super
Lamentationes Ieremie Prophete**

f.92^r **Incipit expositio venerabilis et eximii sacre theologie professoris
Magistri Ricardi de Sancto Victore de mystico somnio Nabuchodonosor
regis et quae sit summa intentionis (= Book 1 of *De eruditionis hominis
interioris*).⁴⁶³**

Super Lamentationes is presented in very much the same way as in *Wa*.

Br1 Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert I^{er}, 2183 (1557-1604)⁴⁶⁴

s.xv; Bois-le-duc, Carthusian; miscellaneous works: Dionysius the Carthusian, Thomas Aquinas, William of Paris, Pseudo-Seneca, Seneca, Petrarch, Gerlach, Hugh, Aegidius, Peter of Blois, 'Iudocus Beysselius', Richard, Jerome, Augustine; paper; 494ff.; 280 x 192mm; 2 columns.

There is an *ex libris* on folio 1^v: 'Iste liber pertinet Carthusiensibus domus Sophie prope buscum ducem.' The numerous works by Dionysius the Carthusian (or

⁴⁶² C. G. Borland, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Library of the University of Edinburgh* (Cambridge, 1895), p.19.

⁴⁶³ *PL* 196, cols 1229D-1298D.

⁴⁶⁴ J. van den Gheyn, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique* (Brussels, 1903), III, pp.330-33.

Denys Ryckel to give him his Flemish name) which take up a substantial part of this manuscript point clearly to ownership by Carthusians.

The wide variety of authors and length of the volume may suggest that it is composite. There are works by both Hugh (or attributed to him) and Richard in the second half of the manuscript:

f.206^r-271^r *Magister Hugo de Sancto Victore super Ecclesiasten*

f.302^v *Liber Ricardi de statu interioris hominis post lapsum*

f.317^v *Liber Ricardi eiusdem de exterminatione mali et promotione boni*

f.334^r *Liber questionum Ricardi de Sancto Victore de potestate ligandi atque soluendi*

f.341^r *Sermo Magistri Hugonis de Sancto Victore de laude patrum*

f.351^v *Cur electi saluandi sint*⁴⁶⁵

f.351^{vb}-383^{ra} *Tractatus Magistri Hugonis de Sancto Victore super Lamentationes Iheremie prophete*

f.458^r *Tractatus moralis Magistri Ricardi de Sancto Victore in partem Canticum Canticorum*

Br1 shares two of these works with *Wa*, namely, *In Ecclesiasten* and *De laude patrum*.

⁴⁶⁵ I have not identified what this work is, but it may possibly be attributed to Hugh, given that it comes within a run of works by him.

Pr **Prague, University Library, 192**⁴⁶⁶

s.xiv/xv; (1). Rosenberg Library, Bohemia; (2) Trebon (Wittingau), Augustinian; miscellaneous works; composite; paper; 188ff.; 290 x 210mm; 55 lines for *Super Lamentationes*.

The manuscript is composed of manifold works of which two are recognizable from their titles as Hugh's:

f.132^v-f.139^v **Incipit Hugo de arrha anime**

f.170^r-f.179^r **Incipit Hugo super Threnos**

The manuscript contains an abridgement of *Super Lamentationes*.⁴⁶⁷

⁴⁶⁶ J. Truhlár, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum latinorum qui in C. R. Bibliotheca Publica atque Universitatis Pragensis asservantur* (Prague, 1905), I, p.71.

⁴⁶⁷ I have not had an opportunity to study *Pr* in any detail. I have mainly been able to do a spot collation.

M Montpellier, Ecole de médecine, 413⁴⁶⁸

s.xii/xiii; Fontenay (diocese of Autun), Cistercian; miscellaneous works: a chronicle of the kings of France, Pseudo-Sallust, Pseudo-Cicero, Hildebert of Lavardin, Bede, Augustine, Robert Foliot 'Miledunensis' (bishop of Hereford), Hugh, Bernard, an *ars dictaminis*, Peter Alfonsi, a necrology of the fifty-five patriarchs, a decree of Gelasius, an account of the apocryphal books, Lanfranc, a tract on marriage, a tract on the sacraments and vestments of the Church, Hugh of Fouilloy; small format; 2 columns (ff.1^r-4^r, single column).

There is an *ex libris* on folio 126^v, possibly in a fourteenth-century hand: 'Liber Sancte Marie de Fonteneto' (above this there is another *ex libris*: 'Iste liber **** pertinet ad abbatiam * de Fontenay / mccccxc**** ordinem cisterciem').

There is a marginal note on folio 2^r, which includes a date: 'Sic in Cronicon legitur ab origine mundi usque ad aduentum Domini sunt anni **xxviii. Ab incarnatione Domini usque modo sunt anni mclxxxvi.' It is possible that this note was written in the margin before the rest of the manuscript was copied. The text of the chronicle is written in a single column, whereas the rest of the manuscript is in double columns. The hand which copied the chronicle does not recur later, while other hands do. If this marginal note is actually contemporary with the rest of the manuscript, then we have useful evidence for dating.

M is a small volume containing a miscellany of writings on a wide range of topics. The final text is part of Hugh of Fouilloy's *De clauastro anime* (1-2:11), entitled 'Hugo de Fulleio canonicus et prior Sancti Laurentii de clauastro materiali et de xii abusionibus et clauastro anime'. (f.108^{ra}). In addition to *Super Lamentationes*, there are several works by ^{or attributed to} Hugh scattered throughout the volume:

⁴⁶⁸ CG, I.4, pp.449-50.

f.22^v *Miscellanea*, 1:76.

f.23^r *Hugo Sancti Victoris super Lamentationes* (expl. f.31r, 'Sederunt in terra et cetera. Hucusque quia destructionem edificiorum descripsit deinceps miseriam et dolorum hominum plangit. Sederunt...' ⁴⁶⁹)

f.39^{ra} *Incipit liber Magistri Hugonis de uirtute et genere orandi*

f.45^{ra} *Sententie Magistri Hugonis Parisiensis* (= *Summa sententiarum*)

f.85^{va} *Quid sit coniugium* (inc. 'Coniugium uero ait Ysidor est consensus maris et femine')

f.87^{ra} *Hugo Sancti Victoris qualiter inuisibilia Dei per uisibilia intelligantur* (= *De tribus diebus*)

f.101^{ra} *Miscellanea*, 3:32

For the title of *Super Lamentationes*, *M*, like *P4*, simply states the author and the text expounded. It is an incomplete copy, breaking off with the opening of Hugh's exposition of 2:10.

N **Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, VII. D. 33** ⁴⁷⁰

s.xii-xiv; Capistrano (Abruzzo), Franciscan; composite; miscellaneous works: Alcuin, Ambrose, Jerome, Martinus Bracarensis, Origen, Pseudo-Orosius, Bernard, Anselm, Hugh; 142ff.; 190 x 100mm; 48-50 lines (for *Super Lamentationes*); several hands (perhaps French).

There is an *ex libris* on folio 142^v: 'Iste liber est loci Sancti Francisci de Capistrano.' The writing is very small to maximize the limited space. The small

⁴⁶⁹ The text breaks off at this point.

⁴⁷⁰ C. Cenci, *Manoscritti francescani della Biblioteca Nazionale de Napoli* (Grottaferrata, 1971), I, pp.471-2.

size of the volume would have made it easy for a friar to carry. Four works by Hugh are included in this miscellany:

f.64^r *Incipit expositio Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes*

f.103^r *De archa Noe morali*

138^r *De uerbo incarnato, Collatio I*

139^r *Eulogium sponsi et sponse*

The only noticeable break in the commentary comes at the allegorical interpretation of 2:1, where the initial of the opening word of the exposition ('Sub') is a coloured *littera notabilior*. The only sense headings are those placed in the text itself to mark the moral sense.

Shared Variants of Φ

1. Omissions, for example:

i.

Quid ergo sunt porte erecte, nisi doctores celestia predicantes, que bene in uectibus pendent, quia de consilio cordis firmatur uerbum predicationis? **Et qui sunt porte destructe et ablate, nisi predicatores negligentes et tepidi?** Quos Dominus per Prophetam increpat dicens: *Canes muti non ualentes latrare.* (281A)

Et qui sunt porte destructe et ablate, nisi predicatores negligentes et tepidi?] *om.*

Φ (*excepto M*)

ii. Omnibus his modis conuenitur indurata conscientia, ut tam multiplici medicamine adhibito tandem **ad penitentiam** emollescat. (301D)

ad penitentiam] *om.* Φ

iii. Urbem uocant quasi sublimem et munitam uirtutibus, que prius Deum in se regnantem habuit, quando adhuc dominio uitiorum **per consensum** subiecta non fuit. (301C)

per consensum] *om.* Φ

iv. Illi autem qui per deuium transeunt super iacentes non plangunt, quia uirtutes suas non propter utilitatem proximorum, sed propter gloriam **propriam** dilatandam ostendunt. (299D)

propriam] *om.* Φ

v. Concupiscentia autem **carnis** in gyro deuorat, quia per omnia huius mundi oblectamenta discurrens, desideria sua mala satiare laborat. (272D)

carnis] *om.* Φ

vi. Et ipse Dominus in Euangelio **Iudeis** loquitur dicens: *Auferetur a uobis regnum Dei et dabitur genti facienti fructum eius.* (275B)

Iudeis] *om.* Φ

The addressee is required here since the whole passage within which this is set concerns Judaism, in particular the Synagogue's loss of 'the fruits of righteousness'.

2. Errors in wording

i.

Sed sciendum est quod sicut affectus de se cogitationes generant, sic ipse rursum cogitationes eos a quibus oriuntur affectus amplius inflammant. Vnde etiam in his qui cor suum ab illicitis cogitationibus diligenter custodiunt, funditus tandem malarum **affectio**num radices arescunt. (290D-291A)

affectio] cogitationum Φ

ii. Constituto in turba Domino, undique circumuallante et premente se **populo**, uenit mulier fluens sanguine et *accedens retro tetigit fimbriam uestimenti eius*. (257C)

populo] turba Φ

iii.

Sed attendite quam fallax sit iste propheta. Delectationes plurimas et in tempora longa permansuras, penam autem exiguam et in breui **transituram** promittit, et fortassis eterna sunt tormenta que sequuntur, cum id quod delectat etiam ad momentum stare non possit. (295C-D)

transituram] permansuram Φ

iv.

Ac si diceret: 'Prius carnis suggestio facile tibi ad persuadendam iniquitatem preualere potuit, nunc uero omnis sollicitudo et industria bonorum **in tua correctione** defecit, quantumque prius ad perpetrandam iniquitatem per contemptum fuisti, temeraria tantum nunc in ipsa iniquitate tua per desperationem es obdurata.' (301A)

in tua correctione] in te Φ

The variant here just about makes sense, but loses point and style. Moreover, there is a certain symmetry between the phrases ‘in tua correctione’ and ‘in ipsa iniquitate tua’.

v. An interesting variant comes at a significant point in the work, where Hugh is drawing a parallel between God’s expulsion of the first man and His rejection of the Jewish people:

Considerans namque Propheta qualiter Deus post eiectionem primi hominis misereri uolens humano generi, solum hunc populum elegit, ut in eo nostre salutis exordia prepararet, quomodo illum date legis mandatis coluit et sua ubique protectione sublimauit, et post hec omnia peccantem et preuaricantem abiecit, et ita prime abiectiōni secundam **adnumerans** plangit dicens: *Factus est Dominus uelut inimicus. Precipitauit menia eius. Dissipauit munitiones eius.* (274C)

adnumerans] adnuntians Φ, annectens Ba

The alternative reading ‘annectens’ in a manuscript of this group may signal that a scribe thought ‘adnuntians’ an error and changed it to a word which was more appropriate. Certainly the verb ‘annecto’, with its sense of connection, is an attractive choice.

3. Synonyms.

i. Cum enim ab amore huius mundi elongare cupimus, confestim eos qui prius amici uidebantur, aduersarios inuenimus. Primum si quidem ad Deum conuerti **uolentes** sub obtentu pestifere dilectionis blandis persuasionibus reuocare contendunt. (261C-D)

uolentes] cupientes Φ

In this instance ‘uolentes’ is preferable as it avoids the repetition of the verb ‘cupio’ which is already employed in the the preceding sentence.

ii. Sequitur: *Omnia speciosa Iacob destruxit in furore suo. Iacob interpretatur supplantator.* Et homo quodammodo non per pugnam, sed per gratiam Diabolum supplantauit, quando illuc unde Diabolus ceciderat, ascendendi **potestatem** accepit. (271B)

potestatem] potentiam Φ

iii. *Cui comparabo te?* Illi qui post agnitam ueritatem retro abeunt peiores sunt his qui nunquam ueritatem **agnouerunt**. Et quanto cuique **excellentior** gradus est, tanto periculosior est lapsus. (292A)

agnouerunt] cognouerunt Φ

excellentior] excelsior Φ (celsior Φ^2)

Both words come from the same verb, ‘excello’, and both have the sense of ‘high’ or ‘lofty’ which is required here. The latter, however, is more commonly used and is, furthermore, synonymous with ‘sublimis’, the word usually applied to such an image, as by Jerome: ‘Quanto sublimior accensus, tanto periculosior casus.’⁴⁷³

4. Additions.

Apart from the first example, these additions are not errors:

i.

Bonam enim opinionem quam maxime ualere famam suam hominem ubique impollutam custodire debere, et si qua fuerint ex infirmitate potius quam ex deliberatione peccata, **propter scandalum proximorum** celanda esse, duplex dampnum fieri si

⁴⁷³ Jerome, *Ep.* 130.7.

altero corrupto per factum, alter corrumpetur per exemplum.
(296A)

propter scandalum proximorum] propter scandalum proximorum plurimorum Φ

ii. Vnde sequitur: *En ista est dies quam expectauimus, desiderando, inuenimus querendo, uidimus exultando*. Vt quanto affligentium te maior est letitia, tanto amarior et intolerabilior sit miseria tua. (302A)

En ista est dies quam expectauimus, desiderando, inuenimus querendo, uidimus exultando.] *En ista est dies quam expectauimus, inuenimus, uidimus. En ista est dies quam expectauimus, desiderando, inuenimus querendo, uidimus exultando.*
Φ

This amount of repetition is perhaps untypical of Hugh. The interweaving of the gerunds within the citation is crisper. But the words ‘Vnde sequitur’ do lead one to expect that what follows is the lemma unadulterated by the expositor’s words. In any case, Hugh usually prefaces the literal interpretation with the opening words of the verse and then interprets the line.

iii.

Que uidelicet uirtutes, quandiu adhuc imperfecte sunt et incipientes et necdum foras prodire possunt, sed intrinsecus adhuc per gratiam eiusdem Spiritus nutriuntur, ut crescant et robuste fiant, quid aliud quam **paruuli quidam in domo patris** educantur, donec ad legitimam etatem perueniant? (259A)

paruuli quidam in domo patris] paruuli quidam adhuc in domo patris Φ

The adverb ‘adhuc’ would then occur thrice in the sentence, but one can see how in this particular phrase it would draw a closer parallel with the virtues which are ‘still’ growing.

iv. Quid est ergo quod filii famelici a **matribus** triticum et uinum querunt, nisi quod cogitationes de bonis affectionibus nate, sed per negligentiam arefacte pristinae dulcedinis saporem in eis inuenire non possunt? (291B)

a matribus] a matribus suis Φ

The possessive adjective here echoes the biblical verse being expounded: ‘Matribus suis dixerunt etc.’ It also emphasizes the familial link, and thus how the dependency of sons on their mothers represents that of thoughts on feelings.

General remarks on the Φ group

This group contains several clear corruptions, notably a number of serious omissions. It is also characterized by numerous variant readings which are difficult to class as mistakes. Indeed, the Φ archetype represented quite a distinctive version, which was in circulation early in the textual history of *Super Lamentationes*. Despite the unreliability of the group, there is at least one occasion where it has a correct reading against all the other manuscripts (with the exception of *Re*), very much as well as a few instances, noted above, where it might be.

Shared Variants Φ^1

1. Omissions

i. Isti ergo propter afflictionem et multitudinem seruitutis **migrant**, quia dum passionibus iustorum communicare nolunt, a consortio iustorum alieni fiunt. (262B)

migrant] *om.* Φ^1

ii. Vel per omne quod pulcrum erat uisu accipere possumus foris disciplinam et decorem bonorum operum, et intus, ut dictum est, **munditiam** bonarum cogitationum. (273C)

munditiam] *om.* Φ^1

iii. Sed credo famosos et diuites in populo iste **planctu** suo honorat (287A)

planctu] *om.* Φ^1

2. Error in word form

Non est lex, scilicet, apud eos; quia etsi libros legis habeant, quia tamen in Christum non credunt, legem non obseruant. (281D)

habeant] habebant Φ^1

3. Wording

Secundum intellectum moralem, ciuitas **significat** animam(253A)

significat] figurat Φ^1

On at least six other occasions this subgroup replaces ‘significo’ with ‘figuro’, a word which Hugh does not use in this work.

It must be said that although *R1* does contain a few more errors than *P1*, the latter makes a few mistakes which are avoided by *R1*. These are minor and could have been corrected by *R1*, for instance where *P1* has ‘dosolatam’ instead of ‘desolatam’, or ‘preuaritores’ for ‘preuaricatores’.⁴⁷⁴

The Φ^1 subgroup has only a few separate errors from the Φ group as a whole. It represents, therefore, a version which is close to the Φ archetype.

⁴⁷⁴ Respectively, 260B and 269D.

Shared variants of Φ^2

I have not as yet had the opportunity to study the two manuscripts from Marchiennes, *D2* and *D3*, at any length, so I am unable to ascertain their precise relationship with the witness from Anchin, *D1*. There is some indication that *D2* and *D3* belong to this subgroup, but that neither descends from *D1*.⁴⁷⁵ It must be kept in mind that where I refer to this subgroup both in this section and in the critical apparatus to the edition, I am for the most part presenting evidence drawn from my collation of *D1*, *P5* and *O3* which points to a common exemplar. I cannot state categorically that *D2* and *D3* share identical readings with these three, which may in fact have particular links, although I think it likely that at least some variants are common to all five witnesses.

1. Errors in wording

i.

Vel speciosa Iacob habuit, quia eum intrinsecus aspectus inuisibilium bonorum letificabat, et foris rerum uisibilium pulcritudo ad Creatoris sui gloriam excitauit. Sed destructa sunt speciosa Iacob, quia Deus in ultionem **primi** reatus a mente eius inuisibilium bonorum cognitionem abscondit et uisibilium rerum aspectum ab illa spirituali iucunditate in concupiscentiam carnis commutauit. (271B-C)

primi] sui Φ^2

ii. Tentorium deforis est, tabernaculum intrinsecus, sicut et tabernaculum federis, in quod Moyses intrat ad consulendum **Dominum**. (274D)

Dominum] populum Φ^2

⁴⁷⁵ In the case of the *Didascalicon*, Buttimer, pp.xxvii-xxxi, has found *D1* to have priority over another volume from Marchiennes (Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 365).

iii.

Vnusquisque nostrum debet esse Ieremias et plangere desolationem suam, quemadmodum ille plangebat desolationem Ierusalem. Et certe si ille sic plangebat ruinam lapidum, nos multo magis plangere debemus **desolationem** animarum nostrarum et dicere unusquisque: *‘Quomodo sedet sola ciuitas plena populo?’* (258B-C)

desolationem] ruinam Φ^2

In the context, the word ‘desolatio’ is more appropriate, since this opening verse of Lamentations is being interpreted tropologically in reference to the desolation of the soul and its abandonment by God once its ‘population’ of virtues have disappeared. However, it upsets the balance of phrasing here, whereas ‘ruina’ satisfies this, all the more because Hugh is here contrasting stones with souls in terms of their relative value.

iv. Nam qui peccata sua confitentur et uitam suam emendare **instituunt**, isti nimirum ad seruitutem Dei accedunt... (263B)

instituunt] constituunt Φ^2

The word ‘instituunt’ is surely preferable here, as the passage concerns those who start correcting their ways but fail. However, the variant ‘constituunt’ would not provoke suspicion: ‘those who determine to amend their lives...’

2. Omissions

Omissions are few and on the whole minor, such as the absence of ‘Sequitur’ before a lemma (265B), bar one *saut du même au même* in a passage where two sentences open with the word ‘Vel’:

Vel in terra defixi sunt, quia solam in Christo carnem attendentes in laqueum perfidie inciderunt. Vel in terra defixi sunt, quia translata spirituali intelligentia legis ad gentes ipsi in carnalibus obseruantiis remanserunt. (281C)

Vel in terra defixi sunt, quia solam in Christo carnem attendentes in laqueum perfidie inciderunt.] *om.* Φ^2

3. Synonyms

At times the variant word is simply a synonym: the verb ‘cerno’ in place of ‘uideo’ (284A) or ‘puto’ for ‘existimo’ (297A), ‘suscipio’ for ‘recipio’ (279C), ‘proicio’ for ‘eicio’ (281D) and ‘ascendo’ for ‘conscendo’ (283C).

4. Correction

i. Completion of a lemma:

‘*Quomodo obtexit etc.*’ (270A)] ‘*Quomodo obtexit caligine in furore suo Dominus filiam Syon. Proiecit de celo in terram inclytam Israel.*’ Φ^2

ii. Emendation of a biblical citation:

a. ‘Fili, accedens ad seruitutem Dei, sta **in timore** et prepara **cor** tuum ad temptationes.’ (263A)⁴⁷⁶

in timore] in iustitia et timore Φ^2

cor] animam Φ^2

b. ‘Non pro eo dico ut **oret** quis.’⁴⁷⁷ (293A)

oret] roget Φ^2

⁴⁷⁶ Ecclesiasticus 1:2

⁴⁷⁷ John 5:16

iii. Addition of a word:

Ac si diceretur: ‘Quibus ipsi irati fuerant, illis **iram et ultionem** diuinam imminere nuntiabant, quatenus cum Deum suarum iniuriarum ultorem dicerent, animos populi ad exhibendam sibi reuerentiam prouocarent. (294C)

iram et ultionem] iram et indignationem et ultionem Φ^2

This subgroup has quite a few textual idiosyncracies. Some of its separate variants are the probable result of emendation, in particular where it preserves the biblical text intact.

Shared Variants of Φ^3

1. Omissions

i. Et uidete qua similitudine tentorium dissipatum dicat: *quasi hortum*, dicit. Sicut hortus **dissipatur**, quando collectis ex eo fructibus sepi destruitur et custodia remouetur... (275B)

dissipatur] *om.* Φ^3 (*M*)

ii. *Defixe sunt in terra porte eius* etc. Quid per portas et uectes ciuitatis, nisi prelatos populi accipere debemus?... Porte enim sunt quando extra positos per uerbum predicationis **ad fidem** introducunt. (280D)

ad fidem] *om.* Φ^3 (*Di*)

2. Error in wording

Defecerunt, inquit, *pre lacrimis oculi mei*. Quantum **putatis** compunctus erat iste qui sic ploravit? (286D)

Quantum putatis] Quantum pietatis Φ^1 , Quante pietatis Φ^3 , Quantum pietate *D1*.⁴⁷⁸

3. Word order

i. Anima nostra et rex debet esse et sacerdos. Rex, quia regere debet carnem suam; sacerdos, quia **Deo iugiter offerre** debet deuotionem suam. (276D)

Deo iugiter offerre] iugiter offerre Deo Φ^3

ii. Est adhuc unus de falsis prophetis qui simulationi deservire suadet. Bonam enim opinionem quam maxime ualere famam suam **hominem ubique impollutam** custodire debere...(296A)

ubique] *om.* Φ

hominem impollutam] impollutam hominem Φ^3

There do not seem to be any shared variant words, except that, at two points, *B* and *C* have the verb ‘signo’ in lieu of ‘significo’ (267C and 276A). The variants which characterize these two witnesses as belonging to a subgroup are few, but sufficiently distinctive to be significant. In one instance, this subgroup inherits an error from the Φ^1 subgroup and then makes a further error. However, there is also proof of a connection between the Φ^3 witnesses and the two Marchiennes witnesses, *D2* and *D3*, with which they share a particular biblical citation (Nahum 1:6), as discussed below (p.253).

⁴⁷⁸ See below p.256.

Shared Variants of Φ^4

1. Omissions

i. Sic anima non ex natura, sed ex gratia uirtutes habet, quas tamen uirtutes eadem gratia non sine naturali consensu **liberi** arbitrii in homine operatur. (272A)

liberi] *om.* Φ^4

ii. Sed cum Deus **intus** presidens nos regit, tunc caro subiecta foris seruit et quanto humilior ei intus subdimur, tanto robustius foris principamur. (259B)

intus] *om.* Φ^4

2. Error in wording

Et quia in carne ueniens occulto quodam consilio Iudeos reppulit, ut gentes ad fidem colligeret, quasi prius murum filie Syon dissipauit, id est protectionem suam a populo Iudeorum abstulit, ac sic deinde funiculum hereditatis sue super populum **gentium** dilatauit. (278B)

gentium] Iudeorum Φ^4

3. Word Order

i. 'Et repleuit in filia', id est in gente Iudea, quam quasi filiam paterno affectu dilexerat, 'humiliatum et humiliatam', hoc est utriusque sexus humiliatis illam repleuit, ut humiliatis, id est deiectis plena sit. (267C)

Et repleuit in filia Iuda humiliatum et humiliatam, id est in gente Iudea quam quasi filiam paterno affectu dilexerat, hoc est utriusque sexus humiliatis illam repleuit...
 Φ^4

ii. **Oculi in sancta Ecclesia sunt prouisores**, uiscera misericordes, iecur studiosi et in bono opere feruentes. (285C)

Oculi in sancta Ecclesia sunt prouisores] Oculi sunt prouisores in sancta Ecclesia
 Φ^4

4. Synonym

Quod si in proposito bono fixos et immobiles uiderint, mox quasi aduersarios abdicant et spernunt, et nonnunquam etiam odiis atrocissimis insectando et penis affligendo, de falsis amicis ueri persecutores **fiunt**. (261D)

fiunt] efficiuntur Φ^4

There are a number of variants not shared by *Ba*, but common to the rest of the witnesses in this subgroup:

1. Omissions

i. Bene ergo **oculi** pre lacrimis deficiunt, quia sepe cum malum uehementer ingruit, discretionis oculum meror caligare facit. Viscera turbantur quia intrinsecus affectus pietatis concutitur.

oculi] *om. Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

ii. Prius enim **mali** planguntur a bonis quam a semetipsis, et dum male sani in sua adhuc perditione exultant quantum flendi sint aliena suspiria indicant. (285C)

mali] *om. Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

2. Wording

i. Ac si diceretur: ‘Deliberat prius quam feriat nec cito profert sententiam, quousque subtili **consideratione examinet** culpam.’ (279D)

consideratione examinet] *examinatione consideret Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

ii. Prelati Ecclesie prophete sunt, quando ad instruendam fidem moresque subiectorum, nunc occulta Scripturarum reserant, nunc de premiis bonorum siue penis malorum **uentura** predicunt. (294B)

uentura] *futura Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

Interestingly, *B* of the Φ^3 subgroup shares a particular reading with these:

Tabernaculum ergo demolitum est et tentorium dissipatum, quia nisi Scribas et Phariseos, doctores populi, in necem Saluatoris compulisset inuidia, **populum ipsum tam crudeliter non dissipasset captiuitatis uindicta**. (275A-B)

populum ipsum tam crudeliter non dissipasset captiuitatis uindicta] *nequaquam ipsum tam crudeliter dissipasset captiuitatis uindicta B Br Eb P4 Wa*

(ϕ^3 sub-group)

Furthermore, *C* shares an omission with them:

Sed quia diuinorum iudiciorum profunditatem homo penetrare non potest, tunc magis quisque in temptatione positus **in ira** se derelictum esse pertimescit, cum et intus et foris temptationibus sollicitari se conspicit. (260B)

in ira] *om. Br C Eb P4 Wa*

The later witnesses *Br1*, *Eb* and *Wa* do not, however, descend directly from *P4*, the earliest of the subgroup. For they share a few variants with *Ba*, of which the following are the most significant instances:

i. Vel per hortum, locum uoluptatis et luxurie intelligere possumus, unde per legem prohibitum est, ne lucus in atriis Domini plantaretur, quia idolorum cultores sub frondosis arboribus et in locis uirentibus sacrificare **solebant**, lasciuie et uoluptati seruientes. Dicat ergo: ‘Dissipauit quasi hortum tentorium suum.’ (268C)

solebant] consueverant *Ba Br1 Eb Wa*

ii. Via presentem uitam significat sicut in Euangelio dicitur: ‘Esto consentiens aduersario tuo **dum es in uia.**’

dum es in uia] dum es cum illo in uia *Ba*, dum es cum eo in uia *Br1 Eb Wa*

Three of the later manuscripts, *Br1*, *Eb* and *Wa*, have a particular affinity:

i. Magis ergo hi insidiis demonum patent, quam illi. quia illos spes future **correctionis** quodammodo retrahit, istos uero desperatio sua ad ruinam impellit. (264A)

correctionis] resurrectionis *Br Eb Wa*

ii. Nunc autem plebem in tribulatione positam minime consolabantur, quia et illi Deum iratum predicabant et isti inimicis regionem uastantibus et populum captiuantibus resistere non **poterant**.

poterant] ualebant *Br1 Eb Wa*

iii. Concupiscentia autem carnis in gyro deuorat, quia per omnia huius mundi oblectamenta discurrens, desideria sua mala satiare **laborat**.

laborat] festinat *Br1 Eb Wa*

This subgroup has several separate errors which are significant. The earliest extant witness of this subgroup, *P4*, dates from the late twelfth century. Three later manuscripts contain a further set of errors, representing a Flemish version of the Φ^4 subgroup.

General remarks on the Φ Group

Of the subgroups of Φ , Φ^1 probably represents a version closer to the Φ archetype than the other subgroups. Moreover, it had an early circulation. Φ^2 includes some idiosyncratic readings which may suggest that some emendation took place. Φ^3 has few separate errors, but contains two which point to it being a later version. All these three groups are related by the fact that they transmit alongside *Super Lamentationes*, the biblical text itself and excerpts from, or attributed to, Jerome. Further evidence that Φ^1 represents the earliest version of this supplementation is that it contains four, rather than two, extracts on the significance of the Hebrew letters. Φ^4 does not contain either the biblical text or the Jerome passages. It includes, however, significant corruptions which preclude descent from a version prior to that transmitted to the other three subgroups. Moreover, it has no witnesses which predate the late twelfth century.

vi. Ungrouped Manuscripts

J Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 729⁴⁷⁹

s.xii; St Jacques, Dominican; collection of Hugh's works; 292ff.; 377 x 256mm; 2 columns of 43 lines; decorated initials.

This is another example of a large twelfth-century collection of works by Hugh. It contains the following texts:

f.1^r *De institutione nouitiorum*

f.11^r *De sacramentis*

f.197^r *De archa Noe*

f.210^r *De vanitate mundi*

f.227^r *De amore sponsi ad sponsam*

f.229^v *De tribus diebus*

f.240^v *Super Lamentationes Ieremie*

f.243^v *De uerbo incarnato, Collatio 1* (fragment)

In Hierarchiam celestem

No title is given to *Super Lamentationes*. Only Hugh's exposition of Lamentations 1 is transcribed here, as though it were a unit.

P6 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 16369⁴⁸⁰

s.xiii; Gerard of Abbéville's library; works by or attributed to Hugh 105ff.; 216 x 152mm (155 x 104mm); 2 columns of 32 lines;pecia notes (?) throughout; red and blue coloured and decorated initials.

⁴⁷⁹ *Bibliothèque Mazarine*, I, 338-39.

⁴⁸⁰ Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits*, IV, p.56.

There is an *ex libris* on folio 105^r: 'Iste liber est collegii pauperum magistrorum Parisius in theologia studentium ex legato Magistri Gerodi de Abbatisvilla.'⁴⁸¹

f.2^r **Speculum Ecclesie**

f.34^r **Incipit liber Magistri Hugonis de operibus trium dierum**

f.50^r **Liber Hugonis de uirtute orandi**

f.55^r **Expositio Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie**

f.76^v **Incipit liber distinctionum Hugonis**

f.102^r **Epistula Hugonis ad Ranulfum de Mauriaco in quo respondet ad quinque questiones quas sibi fecit**

Le **Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Theol. 395**⁴⁸²

s.xiii; Celle (Germany), Cistercian; 140ff.; 355 x 250mm; Hugh and Odo of Moremond.

The manuscript dates from the beginning of the thirteenth century. There is an *ex libris*: 'Liber ueteris Celle Sancte Marie.'

Most of *Le* is devoted to the following works by Hugh:

f.1 *Didascalicon*

f.34 *De meditatione*

f.36 *De laude caritate*

f.44 *De arrha anime*

f.53 *De uoluntate Dei*

f.58 *De cibo Emmanuele*

f.60 *Tractatus super Lamentationes*

f.90 *De anima Christi*

⁴⁸¹ The same *ex libris* is to be found in another thirteenth-century manuscript which contains the *Didascalicon*: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 15315. See Buttimer, p.xxii.

⁴⁸² R. Helssig, *Katalog der Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek zu Leipzig*, Section IV: *Die lateinischen und deutschen Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek zu Leipzig* (Leipzig, 1926-1935), I, pp.614-18.

f.96 (three extracts from the *Didascalicon*)

L3 London, Wellcome Historical Medical Library, 801A⁴⁸³

s.xii/xiv; s.xii: South Italy; s.xiii/xiv: England; Bury St Edmunds, Benedictine; 2 volumes, of which the first is ff.1-119, the second is ff.120-165, 'probably bound separately until the fifteenth century'; both volumes contain miscellaneous works; the second volume: Bruno of Asti, Hugh, Alan de Lille, Hermannus Contractus, fragments of sermons and other extracts; 200 x 145mm (f.127^r, text block = 172 x 118mm); 2 columns of 41-45 lines; red touching up of letters.

The catalogue description, which is based on the notes of Neil Ker, states Bury St Edmunds as the provenance. This is supported by the fragment of a rent-roll on two flyleaves at the end which mentions various places in Suffolk. Moreover, Hugh's *Super Lamentationes* was in the library of this abbey by the fourteenth century in a volume which has been identified as this manuscript.⁴⁸⁴

Super Lamentationes (folios 126^{va}-128^{va}) has no title. Moreover, only Hugh's exposition on Lamentations 1 is copied. The opening initial 'Q' is missing. Lemmata are signalled by the use of red strokes, as are certain words within sections, such as initials of sentences, glossed single items and place names. The close of the commentary is marked by the capitalisation of the final word 'reluctatur', which is also touched up in red. Thus, Hugh's commentary on the first three verses of Lamentations 1:1-3 is treated as a unit.

⁴⁸³ S. A. J. Moorat, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts on Medicine and Science in the Wellcome Historical Medical Library* (London, 1973), II (supplement), pp.1464-67.

⁴⁸⁴ *Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum*, ed. by R. A. B. Mynors et al. (London, 1991), p.231.

Manuscripts not yet consulted⁴⁸⁵

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 2530⁴⁸⁶

s.xii; collection of works by Hugh; 111ff.; 2 columns; 300 x 205mm.

f.1^r *In Hierarchiam celestem*

f.104^r-107^v *Miscellanea* 1.1; 1.174; 1.171; 2.78; 1.172

f.107^v 108^r *Super Lamentationes*

108^r-111^v *Miscellanea* 1.177; 1.173; *Miscellanea* 1.170; 1.176

Ha The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 71. J. 63⁴⁸⁷

s.xii/xiii; works attributed to 'Hugo de Billonio'; 127ff.; 156 x 113mm.

Super Lamentationes is the opening work, extending to folio 74^r. It is not possible to tell from the titles in the catalogue which other works by Hugh are contained in this manuscript. There is a short piece entitled 'Quomodo sapientia uincit malitiam' which may well be *Miscellanea* 1.76.

The mistaken attribution to 'Hugo de Billonio' is unique.⁴⁸⁸

⁴⁸⁵ Without doubt, more witnesses will come to light. For instance, see M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Peterhouse* (Cambridge, 1899), p.180-2. For Peterhouse, 153, ff. 93^v-95^r, he gives the following incipit: '*Quomodo sedet sola ciuitas plena populo. Secundum interpretationem moralem ciuitas significat animam que...*' What follows the lemma matches the opening of Hugh's moral interpretation of Lamentations 1.1 (258A). I have as yet to check this witness.

⁴⁸⁶ *BN*, II, pp.503-4.

⁴⁸⁷ *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae*, (The Hague, 1922), I, p.131.

⁴⁸⁸ I have been unable to discover any figure of this name.

Valencia, Biblioteca de la Catedral, 52⁴⁸⁹

s.xiv; collection of works by Hugh; 124ff.; 400 x 300mm (308 x 200mm); 2 columns of 66 lines; rubrication in red; blue and red initials.

This manuscript ranks amongst the largest of the extant witnesses. It contains works by or attributed to Hugh (wrongful ascriptions are indicated by means of a cross (+), unidentified works by means of an asterisk):

Expositio in Regulam Augustini+

*Miscellanea super Cantica canticorum**

De rotis prelationis+

De claustro anime+

Didascalicon

Expositio super Lamentationes (ff.72^v-86^r)

*Expositio super symbolum**

Instructio monachorum (= *De institutione nouitiorum*)

*Medicina anime**

De tribus uoluntatibus

De uirtute orationis

De sapientia Christi

De archa Noe

All of these works are mentioned in the catalogue of the library which Benedict XIII took from the palace of Avignon to his castle at Peñíscola.⁴⁹⁰ It seems likely that this fourteenth-century manuscript comes from this collection.

⁴⁸⁹ E. Olmos y Canalda, *Catálogo descriptivo: Códices de la Catedral de Valencia* (Valencia, 1943), pp.48-49.

⁴⁹⁰ Faucon, *Librairie*, II, pp. 99-100.

Subiaco, Santa Scolastica, 289⁴⁹¹

s.xiv (1390); Subiaco, Benedictine; miscellaneous works, including Augustine. Hugh, Bernard and Bonaventure; 150 x 120mm; 2 columns.

This small manuscript contains an abridgement of *Super Lamentationes* (only folios 64^r to 65^v or 66^r) Given the limited space devoted to it, it is likely that it is an epitome of only part of *Super Lamentationes* (the section devoted to Lamentations 1.1-3?).

Br2 Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert I^{er}, 1872 (168-94)⁴⁹²

s.xv (some parts s.xvi: f.151: 'Anno 1533 scriptum'); miscellaneous texts: Peter Damian, Peter of Ravenna, John Deelf (prior of Windesheim), Simon Tornacensis, Alcuin, Odo of Canterbury, Serlon (abbot in Anglia), Libertus (bishop), Renwardus (Deacon of Louvain), Peter Comestor, Ambrose, Gratian, Siricius. Prosper, John of Bomal, Origen, Hugh; 340ff.; 380 x 280mm; 2 columns; red and blue initials.

There is an *ex libris* from 1536: 'ex conuentu minoritarum Mechlinie.'

The title given to *Super Lamentationes* is as follows:

ff.321^r-340^v *Deuotus tractatus uenerabilis Magistri de Sancto Victoris super Lamentationes*

⁴⁹¹ G. Mazzatinti and A. Sorbelli, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia* (Forlì, 1890), I, p.215.

⁴⁹² Van den Gheyn, *Bibliothèque Royale*, III, pp.170-173.

vii. Comparison of Groups.

a. Shared Errors between Groups.

$\Sigma + \Delta$

1. Omissions

i. Vnde per legem prohibitum **est** ne lucus... (268B)

est] *om.* $\Sigma + \Delta$

ii. *Quomodo obtexit caligine in furore suo Dominus filiam Syon* (265A)

Syon] *om.* $\Sigma + \Delta$

2. Wording

Quod autem dicit *muros turrium*, quantum ad litteram sic intelligendum est ac si diceret ‘turres **muratas** eius’ intransitiue, hoc est non solum muros ciuitatis extrinsecus, sed muros turrium intrinsecus. (269A)

muratas] munitas $\Sigma + \Delta$

$\Sigma + \Delta + \Omega + \Phi$

Sed quia quosdam differt, ut correcti emendentur, quosdam uero ut perseuerantes **in malis** grauius puniantur, in his quos ad emendationem expectat, arcum tendit. non quasi inimicus, sed quasi propitius. (273A)

in malis Θ] *om.* $\Sigma + \Delta + \Omega + \Phi$

$\Sigma + \Delta + \Omega + \Theta$

There is one common error to these four groups, namely a mistaken pronoun:

*Non est qui consoletur eam ex omnibus caris eius [Ierusalem]: uel quia in tribulatione positam contempnunt, uel quia in tanto malo subuenire non possunt. Caros autem populi illius uocat prophetas et principes, qui consolari **eam** consueuerant, prophete a Deo promittendo auxilium, et principes contra inimicos pugnando et patriam defendendo. (259C)*

eam Φ Re] eos $\Sigma + \Delta + \Omega + \Theta$ (*excepto Re*)

$\Delta + \Omega + \Theta + \Phi$

‘Inter angustias,’ inquit, ‘comprehenderunt eos.’ Et attende **que sint angustie** eorum qui a Deo recedunt. (262D)

que sint angustie Σ]⁴⁹³ que sit angustia $\Delta + \Omega + \Theta + \Phi$

$\Theta + \Phi$

i. Possidentibus diuitias posse uirtutum merita augmentari prenuntiat, ut ab amantibus diuitias omnia uirtutum merita tollat et primum animos ad querendas diuitias cupiditate, deinde ad retinendas cum **acquisite** tenacitate corrumpat. (295D)

acquisite] exquisite $\Theta + \Phi$

⁴⁹³ In fact, most of the Σ^2 manuscripts have the indicative ‘sunt’.

ii. Quod si aliquando uirtutes suas et fortia acta sua proximis suis ad exemplum proponunt, nequaquam hoc desiderio gloriandi sed amore consulendi faciunt. (299D)

suis] *om.* $\Theta + \Phi$

b. Difficult Readings

At a number of places in *Super Lamentationes*, there is significant disagreement between the extant witnesses. Some of these pose difficulties for an editor of the text. The most obvious examples are here discussed.

i. Title

The manuscripts differ greatly on the title they give the commentary.⁴⁹⁴ A number of witnesses bear no rubric at all, notably two from the twelfth century, *G* and *V*, of which the second is from St Victor. Given the diversity of readings, it is likely that Hugh gave his exposition of Lamentations no title. What we find, then, probably constitutes a later revision. Perhaps the most convincing heading is the plainest, such as that which we find in *P4*: ‘Magister Hugo super Lamentationes.’ But it seems that some more precise description was favoured, especially in the twelfth century, when *tractatus*, *expositio* and *explanatio* were all applied to *Super Lamentationes*. Of these, *explanatio* occurs in just one manuscript, *Di*. The description *expositio* is used in several and is the term applied both to the work in the *Indiculum* and also to any commentary of Lamentations in the *Liber ordinis Sancti Victoris*.⁴⁹⁵ Nevertheless, *tractatus* is the most favoured title (with the exception of the Ω group). Almost half the extant witnesses from the twelfth century employ this designation.⁴⁹⁶

⁴⁹⁴ See the critical apparatus.

⁴⁹⁵ See above p.25.

⁴⁹⁶ The implications of choice of title for the reception of Hugh’s work are discussed below pp.275-6.

A few witnesses state specifically that this is not a commentary on the whole of Lamentations. It would seem that this comment originated early on in the text's history. It is a feature shared by certain Σ manuscripts and those of Δ^1 (in the case of the latter a feature before the contamination of *E* by Σ^2). It is also transmitted to two witnesses from a distinct group, *Pl* and *Rl*.⁴⁹⁷

ii. Biblical citation

A particular crux comes at 267A, where Hugh is expounding a line of 2:4, 'Effudit quasi ignem indignationem suam'. He discusses the simile, drawing attention to the fact that God 'poured out' His anger like fire, not water, implying that it is the latter one would expect with the verb 'effundo'. Hugh suggests that the choice of fire rather than water emphasizes the sheer violence of God's wrath. He contrasts the destructive power of fire and water, invoking a citation from another of the Prophets as support:

Effudit quasi ignem indignationem suam. Non quasi aquam, sed quasi ignem. Violentia enim aquarum deicere et dissipare res solet, non consumere. Quarum inundationem per alium Prophetam Dominus comminatur dicens:

Ignis uero non tantum destruit, sed consumit.' Atque ideo recte indignatio Dei quasi ignis effundi dicitur, quando diuina ultio usque ad consumptionem euagatur. Postremo etiam in ipso effusionis nomine uolentia et, ut ita dicam, abundantia tribulationis exprimitur. (267A)

That a contrast is being drawn here is confirmed by the sentence immediately following the intended quotation with its adversative 'uero', coupled with the construction of 'non tantum...sed' (highlighted in bold): 'But fire' or 'Fire on the other hand not only destroys, but consumes.'

The Victorine witness *V* leaves a gap here, as do a few others: another Σ manuscript (*Val*), three Δ^2 manuscripts (*G*, *Cal* and *O4*), two Φ manuscripts (the twelfth-century *DI* and thirteenth-century *N*) and one ungrouped witness before

⁴⁹⁷ See above p.192.

correction (*Le*). Others have no gap, but treat the sentence which follows as though it were the citation, which it clearly cannot be. This is the reading we find in the manuscript groups Ω , Σ^2 , Δ^1 and Φ^2 (as well as in the case of *P5* which descends from *D1*). Other manuscripts include a biblical quotation, as follows:

a. *B, D2, D3*: Indignatio eius effusa est ut ignis.⁴⁹⁸

This citation does not make sense in the context, as the words ‘Quarum inundationem’ clearly refer to the ‘waters’ of the preceding sentence. *D2* and *D3* are otherwise textually related to *D1*, so perhaps the citation was added to the exemplar after *D1* was copied, but before *D2* was.

b. *C*: Indignatio eius effusa est ut aqua

Such a biblical citation does not exist. Clearly the exemplar from which *C* was copied had the quotation from Nahum 1:5 which we find in *B, D2* and *D3*. But a corrector has seen that they are wrong, and has substituted ‘ut aqua’ for ‘ut ignis’.

c. Θ , *p.c. M*: Ignis deuorabit speciosa deserti.⁴⁹⁹

This, once again, is a clear mistake. It misses the point of the contrast, since the biblical quotation would have to be illustrating the force of water. The Θ manuscripts solve this problem by changing ‘Quarum inundationem’ to ‘Quam indignationem’, so that the citation becomes appropriate, since it is no longer a water but a fire simile that is being illustrated by it. This is proof of conscious emendation by the Θ group.

d. *Ba*: Super eos effundam quasi aquam iram meam.⁵⁰⁰

⁴⁹⁸ Nahum 1:6

⁴⁹⁹ Joel 1:20

⁵⁰⁰ Hosea 5.10.

e. *Va2*: Effundam sicut aquam super uos indignationem meam.

This is not a biblical citation. It appears to be an adaptation of the citation from Hosea in *Ba*. However, these manuscripts are in no other way related.

f. *Le*: Aqua inundabit et delebitur fedus uestrum cum morte et pactum uestrum cum inferno non stabit.⁵⁰¹

This quotation from Isaiah suits the term ‘per alium Prophetam’, a phrase which probably brought this prophet to mind before all others. However, this is a later addition to *Le*. Originally a gap had been left. *Le* dates from the thirteenth century (as do also *Ba* and *Va2* above). There are, therefore, no early witnesses to the more fitting quotations.

Other manuscripts omit the phrase ‘Quarum inundationem per alium Prophetam comminatur dicens...’ and thus have no need to include a biblical citation here (*P4*, *Br1*, *Wa*, *Eb*, *Pr*, *O2* and *P6*). Five of these are related, belonging to the Φ^4 subgroup. The earliest manuscript to make this omission dates no earlier than the late twelfth century.

There is, then, quite a range of differences in readings here. The variety of citations and the extended omission suggest that there was originally a lacuna. The *Patrologia Latina* supplies a quotation from Genesis, which is a clear error, given the reference to a prophet.

iii. Enumeration in the prologue to Lamentations 2

We have seen how Lamentations 2 is divided into five rhetorical categories.⁵⁰² At a certain point in this analysis, several manuscripts, mainly from the twelfth century, contain an additional phrase:

Conquestio est a principio alphabeti usque ad eum locum ubi dicitur: *Cui comparabo te* etc. Ibi increpatio incipit et tenditur

⁵⁰¹ Isaiah 28:18.

⁵⁰² See above pp.54-8.

usque ad eum locum ubi dicitur *Fecit Dominus que cogitavit* etc. Ibi consolatio incipit et tenditur usque ad eum locum ubi dicitur: *Deduc quasi torrentem lacrimas*; **in qua preceptione** peccatores informantur ad penitentiam, et tenditur usque ad eum locum ubi dicitur: *Vide, Domine*. Abinde usque ad finem deprecatio est, in qua Propheta Dominum pro peccatoribus exorat. (264C-D)

in qua preceptione] Ibi preceptio incipit, in qua preceptione *B Di M O2*

ibi preceptio *in marg. E*, Preceptio est, in qua preceptione Θ , in quo preceptio est *C*, in qua preceptio est *Le*

The variety of readings here suggests that emendation has taken place in manuscripts, sometimes independently of each other. At first sight, the inclusion of the words 'Ibi preceptio incipit' seems appropriate. It has, after all, been the pattern in the divisions above. There are stylistic reasons, however, against the inclusion of this phrase. Hugh would surely have avoided the repetition of 'preceptio...preceptione', especially in such close proximity. He may have chosen not to reuse the phrase 'Ibi...incipit' a third time, preferring to vary the construction. After all, he adopts other words to mark the final and fifth division of the text: 'Abinde usque in finem...' I would in fact opt to preserve what I believe to be the original text, judging that the words 'in qua preceptione' make sense on their own, since the line that they follow - *Deduc quasi torrentem lacrimas* - is an injunction in imperative form. Further, the words 'Ibi...incipit' have been used where there is a definite verse break: *Cui comparabo te?* refers to 2:13; *Fecit Dominus* to 2:17. But *Deduc quasi torrentem lacrimas* comes in the middle of verse 18, of which fact Hugh himself is well aware.⁵⁰³ The variants, then, are probable revisions.

⁵⁰³ See 307C, which is discussed above p.55.

iv. Exclamation

Hugh's exposition of 2:11 ('Defecerunt pre lacrimis oculi mei') includes the following exclamation:

Defecerunt, inquit, pre lacrimis oculi mei. Quantum putatis compunctus erat iste qui sic plorauit?

The sentence which follows the lemma might be translated as follows: 'How much do you think he was distressed who lamented in this way.'

....

However, some Φ manuscripts offer different readings:

Quantum putatis] Quantum pietatis Φ^1 , Quante pietatis Φ^3 , Quantum pietate *DI*
P5

Only the final variant could be accepted as an alternative reading. It is however clearly an emendation of the error made by Φ^1 . In fact the letter 'e' is written over an erasure. The second reading here appears to be a failed attempt at correction. It is probable that these variants result from a substitution of 'pietatis' for 'putatis' through confusion about the construction.

v. Contrast

In his moral interpretation of 1:1, Hugh distinguishes between vices and senses, as follows (I include the error made by most witnesses):

Et nota quod dixit *domina* non *princeps gentium* et *princeps*, non *domina prouinciarum*; quia uitia, que naturalia non sunt, comprimi debent, sensus **enim** quia naturales sunt, non comprimi sed regi necesse habent, ut in illis extirpandis homo esse studeat districtus, in istis moderandis et custodiendis discretus. (258D)

enim] autem *Mu P7 R1*, uero *O3*, om. *C Re*,

The word ‘enim’ is evidently wrong here, since a contrast is drawn. In fact, an adversative seems appropriate at this point. I presume that early on in this text’s history, an abbreviation for such a word was miscopied as ‘enim’. It was restored in a few later witnesses.

vi. Omission

All the extant witnesses with the exception of those of Σ have a clear omission at a certain point, marked here in bold:

De qua uidelicet pena adhuc subinfertur cum dicitur: ‘Et dixerunt: “Deuorabimus.” ’ Quid namque est aliud deuorare nisi **animam** exeuntem a corpore ad dampnationem eternam absorbere? Sciendum uero est quod nunquam animam a corpore exeuntem deuorare sufficiunt, quam prius in corpore positam igne uitiorum non excoxerunt. (303A)

The Σ^2 manuscripts include the required word, but have a word order which suggests later addition: ‘exeuntem animam’.

vii). Wording

At another point, the Σ^2 manuscripts are alone in bearing a correct reading:

‘Quomodo obtexit caligine in furore suo Dominus filiam Syon’, quia hominem, quem ad contemplandum lumen **ueritatis** creauerat, peccantem deserens in tenebris ignorantie reliquit. (270A)

ueritatis Σ^2] eternitatis *cett.*

Here ‘light of truth’ is preferable as it contrasts with the ‘darkness of ignorance’.

An Overview of the Manuscript Tradition

A mass of information has been gathered above from the extant manuscripts which contain *Super Lamentationes*. This provides the basis for conclusions about the dissemination and reception of this work from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries. It is now possible to draw together the main threads of this evidence.

1. Dissemination.

i. Number and Dating of Manuscripts

Super Lamentationes enjoyed an active diffusion during this period. It is contained in fifty-five extant manuscripts.⁵⁰⁴ Not all of these contain complete texts: in two the work is interrupted; three include the exposition of Lamentations 1:1-3, but not the rest; seven have abridgements.⁵⁰⁵ The majority date from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. A breakdown of their distribution according to the century of their transcription is as follows (with the strong proviso that in some cases, only an approximate date can be given):⁵⁰⁶

s.xii	22
s.xiii	18
s.xiv	4
s.xv	11

A fair proportion of the witnesses date from the twelfth century, but copying of *Super Lamentationes* is almost as vigorous in the thirteenth. There appears to be

⁵⁰⁴ In *Die Überlieferung*, pp.68-74, Goy lists forty-eight manuscripts, of which one is a mistaken attribution (p.71, no. 27, Paris, BN lat. 1913a, a Carolingian manuscript containing Augustine's *Confessions*). Carlotta Dionisotti discovered another copy (*L3*). Willis Johnson drew my attention to a further manuscript (*Ca2*). Rainer Berndt at the Hugo von Sankt-Viktor Institut informed me of the existence of more (*Br2*, *Ha* and *L1*, of which I have not as yet consulted the first two). I myself have added three other witnesses (*I*, *R2* and *T1*). Without doubt, more will be unearthed in due course.

⁵⁰⁵ See below pp.285-7.

⁵⁰⁶ Where a manuscript might date from either of two centuries (e.g. s.xii/xiii or s.xiv/xv), I have classified it as belonging to the later one.

a decline in the fourteenth century (possibly owing to the ravages of the plague), with a sort of ‘revival’ in the fifteenth.

ii. Geographical Diffusion

The breakdown of the geographical diffusion of the extant manuscripts is as follows (again these are approximate figures):

Northern France and Flanders	30
England	13
Germany, Bohemia and Austria	7
Southern Europe (Southern France, Italy and Spain)	5

a. Northern France and Flanders.

Not surprisingly, this constituted the main area for diffusion. Over half of the extant witnesses originated there, including seventeen of those which date from the twelfth century. Only one surviving manuscript is definitely known to have originated from Paris, V from St Victor itself. The other copies are distributed between Normandy, the North East, Champagne and Burgundy.

Normandy was probably an important area of diffusion. Medieval library catalogues indicate that at least four institutions owned a copy of *Super Lamentationes*.⁵⁰⁷ At least two separate versions, namely Σ and Φ , were in circulation in the twelfth century. Fécamp, to which R1 belonged, was known to be involved in book exchange.⁵⁰⁸ This abbey had links with Bec, probably the most important Norman centre of learning. Although few manuscripts have survived from the library of the latter, a medieval catalogue does exist.⁵⁰⁹ This dates from 1142 to 1164 and several works by Hugh are included. Item 9 has the following description: ‘in alio (uolumine) Hugo super Lamentationes Ieremie.’

⁵⁰⁷ G. Nortier, *Les Bibliothèques médiévales des abbayes bénédictines de Normandie* (Paris, 1971), p.215.

⁵⁰⁸ J. W Thompson, *The Medieval Library* (Chicago, 1939), pp.233 and 242.

⁵⁰⁹ G. H. Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui* (Bonn, 1885), pp. 257-266.

Bec, then, was possibly the axis of diffusion of this text in Normandy and perhaps even further afield to England.

Anchin in the North East had connections with Bec.⁵¹⁰ In the mid-twelfth century both Anchin and its neighbour Marchiennes made copies of *Super Lamentationes*. Copies belonging to the same group (Φ) figure also in this general area towards the end of the twelfth century, at Vaucelles and further north at Ter Doest. Three witnesses from the fifteenth century attest to a continuing interest in this commentary in this northern area, in particular in Flanders.

There are a cluster of twelfth-century copies in Champagne, of which all but one are closely related (*Re*, *Tl*-3 and *C*, the last of which belongs to the Φ group, and not surprisingly was found in North Champagne). Burgundy was home to two extant manuscripts, *Di* and *M*, both from different groups (Ω and Φ respectively). It is possible that Pontigny also possessed the work, given that Thomas Becket transported the Ω version back to Canterbury (in the form of *OI*).⁵¹¹

b. England

During the decades which immediately followed Hugh's death, the work travelled further afield, reaching the Gloucestershire region of England by the mid-twelfth century. We have clues as to how this work came to be here so shortly after Hugh's death. Andrew of St Victor (d.1175), Hugh's pupil and a renowned biblical exegete, moved from St Victor to Herefordshire, where he was elected abbot of Wigmore, a daughterhouse of St Victor, in 1149.⁵¹² Andrew left this post in about 1155, returning probably to St Victor. He was persuaded to resume his abbacy of Wigmore, which he did in 1161/1163. Thus, Andrew made one, and possibly two, trips from St Victor to Herefordshire, on either of which he may well have transported copies of his master's works. Our witness *H* from St Peter's, Gloucester, or *E*, which has been placed in this general area,⁵¹³ perhaps

⁵¹⁰ See H. E. J. Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform* (Oxford, 1970), p.193, n.2.

⁵¹¹ See above pp.164-5.

⁵¹² R. Berndt, *André de Saint-Victor, exégète et théologien* (Paris-Turnhout, 1991), p.49; Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, pp.112-115.

⁵¹³ See above pp.139-43.

descended from a copy which Andrew brought on his return to Wigmore in the early 1160s, given that it contains a work by Richard of St Victor (d.1173).⁵¹⁴ Even if Andrew was not himself the bearer of the exemplar for these Gloucestershire copies, his presence at Wigmore is likely to have promoted book exchanges between mother- and daughter-house.⁵¹⁵

Further clues as to how Hugh's writings came to be diffused in England in the twelfth century are to be found in a surviving correspondence between three members of the Benedictine community at St Albans and the prior of St Victor.⁵¹⁶ These date from between 1167 and 1173 and involved the Abbot of St Albans, Simon, its prior Warin, a novice or monk by the name of Matthew and the above-mentioned Richard of St Victor, pupil of Hugh and prior of that institution. Six letters have survived which reveal that these two centres had close links. Matthew and perhaps later the prior's nephew Warin, actually spent time studying at St Victor. More relevant to our enquiry is the fact that Abbot Simon wrote to Richard requesting that a copyist be sent from St Albans to St Victor in order to transcribe those works of Hugh which the former institution did not possess in its library. A list of the writings by Hugh which were already in the library was included. It is thought that Richard sent back a catalogue of Hugh's *oeuvre*, from which possibly descends the famous fifteenth-century *Indiculum* in *O4*.⁵¹⁷

The trail does not end here. It seems that St Albans (in the words of Thomson), served as a '*publishing-house* for English distribution of continental religious literature'.⁵¹⁸ Christopher de Hamel is of the view that other monasteries may have sent copyists to St Albans.⁵¹⁹ Certainly the *Registrum Anglie*, an early fourteenth-century catalogue of books in England, Scotland and Wales, indicates

⁵¹⁴ *H*: Benjamin minor

⁵¹⁵ Further evidence of a Victorine connection with the West of England in the twelfth century is provided by a manuscript which is related to *E* and *H*, Elverum, Folkbiblioteket, 1. See L. Gjerlöv, 'A Twelfth-century Victorine or Cistercian Manuscript in the Library of Elverum', *Revue Bénédictine*, 82 (1972), 335, where he suggests that this English manuscript is related to *V*.

⁵¹⁶ For what follows on the links between St Alban's and St Victor, I have drawn heavily upon R. M. Thomson, *Manuscripts from St Alban's Abbey 1066-1235* (University of Tasmania, 1982), pp.64-66. This correspondence is printed in *PL* 196, cols 1227-30.

⁵¹⁷ See R. W. Hunt, *The Library of St Albans Abbey*, in M. B. Parkes and A. G. Watson (eds), *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries: Essays presented to N. R. Ker* (London, 1978), pp. 253-4.

⁵¹⁸ Thomson, *St Albans*, p.65.

⁵¹⁹ C. de Hamel, *A History of Illuminated Manuscripts* (London, 1994), p.86.

that there were nineteen works by Hugh in the library of St Albans, including *Super Lamentationes*. Whether or not St Albans was heavily involved in disseminating Hugh's *oeuvre*, many of the institutions where, according to the *Registrum Anglie*, this particular text was housed, possessed works by Hugh also held by this centre. Thus we find, for instance, that St Albans, Christ Church (Canterbury), the Augustinian priory at Merton (Surrey), all have, in addition to heavily copied works such as *De archa Noe*, other texts of lesser diffusion, such as *De quinque septenis* and *De anima Christi*, possible evidence of interchange between institutions.

The *Registrum Anglie* in fact lists several institutions which housed *Super Lamentationes*. The manuscripts are for the most part lost. These were housed in the following libraries (excluding those mentioned above): Margam, Glamorganshire (Cistercian); St Augustine's, Bristol (Augustinian); Buckfast, Devon (Cistercian); Lenton, Nottinghamshire (Benedictine); Merevale, Warwickshire (Cistercian); Waltham Abbey (Augustinian); St Paul's, London or Waverly, Surrey (the latter, Cistercian); Lewes, Sussex (Benedictine). It is evident from this list that other manuscripts were circulating in the West of England in addition to *E*, *H* and *W*.⁵²⁰

c. Germany, Austria and Bohemia

Early in its textual history, *Super Lamentationes* travelled as far as Austria. *G* from St Lambrecht dates from the mid-twelfth century and is related to witnesses from England (for example, the later *Ca1* and *Va2*). Two other witnesses from this area exist, namely the fifteenth-century abridgements *I* and *Vi*.

According to the evidence, *Super Lamentationes* had little diffusion in Germany. At any rate, few witnesses survive from here, the earliest dating from the thirteenth century (*Ba* from Himmerod near Trier and *Le* from Celle in Saxony). Published medieval catalogues for the area have no reference to this

⁵²⁰ T. W. Williams, 'Gloucestershire Medieval Libraries' in *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society for 1910*, pp. 78-195, has a number of entries for Hugh's *Super Lamentationes*. This supports a strong diffusion of this text in the West of England.

work. Hugh, of course, was educated in Saxony by the regular canons of Hammersleben in the diocese of Halberstadt.⁵²¹ Perhaps this abbey also received several other works from their ex-pupil, including *Super Lamentationes*.

d. Southern Europe (South France, Spain and Italy)

With the possible exception of *Val*, there are no extant twelfth-century manuscripts containing *Super Lamentationes* in Southern Europe. However, in the thirteenth century, the text travelled to Capistrano in Abruzzo, probably from Northern France, and possibly carried there by a friar. An abridgement, which dates from 1390, was in the library of the learned Benedictines of Subiaco. In the case of Provence, there is one extant copy from the papal library of Avignon, which ended up travelling with Benedict XIII to Peñíscola.⁵²² Another fourteenth-century volume, *Vn*, which is now preserved in the Cathedral Library at Valencia, contained *Super Lamentationes* in a collection of Hugh's works. Although I have not seen *Vn*, I would guess that it came from the papal collection. It is possible that this collection housed more than one copy of *Super Lamentationes*. The Peñíscola catalogue (1411-1415) has two separate references to the commentary (numbers 477 and 499), the first of which tops the list of volumes of Hugh's writings:

‘(477). Primo expositio Hugonis de Sancto Victore super librum Treannorum
(sic)

(479). Item expositio de Trennis...’ (sic)⁵²³

The similarity in title implies common ancestry. Interestingly, *Super Lamentationes* is also mentioned in the catalogue for the library of Urban V (pope at Avignon from 1362-1370).⁵²⁴

⁵²¹ See above p.10.

⁵²² See above pp.166-7.

⁵²³ Faucon, *Librairie*, II, p.99

⁵²⁴ Idem, I, p.112: ‘(216) Primo quidam magnus liber dicti Hugonis, sine postibus et coopertura super Trenis...’.

iii. Institutional Diffusion

It is worth taking a closer look at the particular centres which possessed this commentary to discover its readership. A breakdown of known provenances of extant manuscripts is as follows:⁵²⁵

Cistercian:

s.xii

<i>B</i>	Ter Doest
<i>C</i>	Signy
<i>Di</i>	Cîteaux
<i>P1</i>	Beaupré
<i>P2</i>	Foucarmont
<i>P4</i>	Vaucelles
<i>T2</i>	Clairvaux

s.xii/s.xiii

<i>M</i>	Fontenay
<i>Cal</i>	Wardon, Bedfordshire

s.xiii

<i>Ba</i>	Himmerod
<i>Le</i>	Celle

Benedictine:

s.xii

<i>D1</i>	Anchin
<i>D2</i>	Marchiennes

⁵²⁵ The date refers to that of the manuscript, not that of when it belonged to these institutions.

<i>G</i>	St Lambrecht
<i>H</i>	St Peter’s, Gloucester
<i>O1</i>	Christ Church, Canterbury
<i>Re</i>	St Thierry
<i>R1</i>	Fécamp

s.xiii

<i>D3</i>	Marchiennes
<i>L3</i>	Bury St Edmunds
<i>Ma</i>	Cluny
<i>R2</i>	Jumièges

s.xiv

<i>Su</i>	Subiaco
-----------	---------

Augustinian / Collegial:

s.xii

<i>V</i>	St Victor
<i>T3</i>	St Etienne-de-Troyes

Carthusian:

s.xv

<i>Br1</i>	Bois-le-duc
<i>I</i>	Schnals

Celestine:

s.xv

<i>S</i>	Villeneuve
----------	------------

Paris University:

s.xii

J St Jacques⁵²⁶

s.xiii

P5

P6 bequeathed by Gérard of Abbeville to a college of ‘poor Masters
at Paris in Theology’,⁵²⁷

Franciscan:

s.xiii

N Capistrano

O3 Hereford

s.xv

Mu Regensburg

Papal Library:

s.xiv

P7 Library of Pope Benedict XII, Avignon / Peñiscola

Private Collection:

s.xiv/xv

Pr Rosenberg Library, Bohemia⁵²⁸

⁵²⁶ This was clearly owned by the Dominicans in the thirteenth century.
⁵²⁷ See above p243
⁵²⁸ Probably in the seventeenth century. Later, it belonged to the Augustinian canons of Trebon.

The above breakdown of known provenances of extant manuscripts indicates a certain pattern in the diffusion of this commentary. It is clear that it was copied largely within a monastic milieu, especially during its early history. The Cistercian order in particular played an important role in transmitting the work. These abbeys were often young establishments: Vaucelles, Himmerod, Beaupré and Signy were founded in the 1130s, Foucarmont in 1147 and Ter Doest in 1176.⁵²⁹ The work figured in the library not only of Cîteaux, the foundation house of the order, but also at Clairvaux, which, through Bernard, became very much the centre of the Cistercian world. Perhaps these leading monasteries influenced the book production of their daughter-houses or vice versa. Clairvaux founded one hundred and sixty-seven monasteries, Cîteaux twenty-eight.

Of course, the Cistercian order played an active role in the transmission of texts generally at this time.⁵³⁰ However, one might imagine that some conscious selection of appropriate works took place. Although they were a burgeoning order, the Cistercians openly rejected the intellectual activity of both the urban schools and the Benedictines. That they chose to copy and diffuse Hugh's *Super Lamentationes* was not simply a consequence of their involvement in book production. The text itself might well have appealed to these 'hard-line' monks, given its doleful subject-matter, its concern with the ills afflicting the Church, its rejection of the carnal, its emphasis on the individual soul's fight against evil and its calls for repentance.

The Cistercians had no monopoly on such topics nor on the transmission of texts: witness the Benedictine manuscripts of this commentary, one of which comes from Cluny itself. However virulent some Cistercian writings against the Black Monks may have been, interchange of texts went on between these two orders. For example, a manuscript from the Benedictine house of Fécamp (*RI*) is very closely related to one from the Cistercian abbey of Beaupré (*PI*). This may

⁵²⁹ The dates of these foundations are given in Frédéric van der Meer, *Atlas de l'Ordre cistercien* (Amsterdam-Brussels, 1965).

⁵³⁰ See J. Châtillon, 'La transmission de l'oeuvre de Hugues: à propos d'un livre récent de Rudolph Goy', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 15 (1980), p.62. It would be interesting to pinpoint which of Hugh's works were preferred by the Cistercians.

be coincidental. It may equally bear further witness to the fact that, in the twelfth century, Cistercians dominated the task of transmitting Hugh's commentary.

Links between St Victor and Cistercian centres need to be explored. It is almost certain that Victorine works travelled to Clairvaux with Henry of France, brother of Louis VII, in 1147. This prince studied at St Victor before becoming a monk at this all-important Cistercian centre.⁵³¹ Certain manuscripts belonging to the library of this monastery are believed to have been made at St Victor.⁵³² It is also worth noting that Hugh and Bernard of Clairvaux exchanged some correspondence. A short section of *De sacramentis* is thought to have been written in reponse to a request from Bernard.⁵³³ Perhaps texts accompanied letters on occasion.

Whether or not Cistercian monks were heavily involved in the actual copying of *Super Lamentationes*, it is often this order which houses the work. This does not apply only to France. The two earliest German copies, *Ba* and *Le*, belonged to White Monks. Several English Cistercian houses as well housed it.⁵³⁴

Certainly, monastic orders in general made a major contribution to the transmission of this commentary, as they did for the whole of Hugh's *oeuvre*.⁵³⁵ However, this text was not confined to the cloister. In the thirteenth century, it was in the possession of friars. In at least two instances (*P5* and *P6*) it was to be found in use within the context of the Paris schools. *P6* bears an *ex libris* which speaks of Master Gérard of Abbeville (d.1272) bequeathing the whole manuscript to a 'college of poor preachers'.⁵³⁶ Gérard in fact left about three hundred manuscripts to the Sorbonne.⁵³⁷ Many of these he had himself inherited from the chancellor of Amiens, Richard of Fournival (1201-c.1260), who had an impressive

⁵³¹ Patricia Stirnemann, 'La production des manuscrits et la bibliothèque de Saint-Victor', *L'abbaye parisienne de Saint-Victor au moyen âge*, ed. J. Longère (Paris - Turnhout, 1991), p.140-1. Henry of France later became the bishop of Beauvais and had under his protection the Cistercian abbey of Beaupré, which possessed an early copy of the *Super Lamentationes*.

⁵³² Ibid.

⁵³³ *PL* 182, cols 1039a-1041

⁵³⁴ *Cal* and see above p.262.

⁵³⁵ Châtillon, 'La transmission', p.62.

⁵³⁶ See above p.243. For the biography of Gérard of Abbeville, see R. H. Rouse, 'The early library of the Sorbonne', *Scriptorium*, 21 (1967), p.48: he was a regent master of theology from 1257 onwards. In 1262 he became protector of the privileges of the university.

⁵³⁷ See Rouse, 'Sorbonne', p.48.

private library.⁵³⁸ This particular manuscript may then have been acquired by Gérard from Richard. It may also have been produced in the milieu of the university. Supporting evidence for this is the fact that it has throughout what I suspect are *pecia* notes. It is wholly devoted to Hugh's works and attributes to him one which is entitled *Distinctiones*, a term with definite overtones of the Paris school-rooms. Furthermore, the text of *Super Lamentationes* contained within it is an abridgement, perhaps to facilitate the students' studies.

Leading ecclesiastical institutions may have owned a copy of *Super Lamentationes* in their private libraries, for example, the fourteenth-century manuscript in the collection of Benedict XIII (d.1423), antipope at Avignon from 1394 to 1417. Perhaps even laity possessed copies, as in the case of *T3*, the *de luxe* manuscript from St Etienne de Troyes, which looks as if it was made for an aristocrat. It is certainly of a size which might suggest a personal copy rather than a book for display in an ecclesiastical institution. It does, however, bear the *ex libris* of St Etienne de Troyes.

2. Evidence for Uses of the Commentary

The manuscripts can provide clues to the usage of *Super Lamentationes*. The presentation of the text on the page, material that is inserted into it or next to it, the designation it is given, the other works that accompany it in the volume (or lack of them) can all suggest the ways in which the text was used, whether it was, for instance, studied in the school-room, read aloud to the chapter, favoured for private, devotional reading or served a variety of purposes.

Drawing such conclusions is, however, fraught with difficulties. Manuscript evidence might be interpreted in a variety of ways. I shall take one particular example, *T3*, to illustrate this problem. This witness is distinctive for a number of reasons. First, the *mise-en-page* is striking indeed. Just to recap, its pages have whole verses of Lamentations laid out in columns in large letters, accompanied by their Hebrew letters. The actual commentary runs down the side

⁵³⁸ See R. H. Rouse, 'Manuscripts belonging to Richard of Fournival', in *Revue d'Histoire des Textes*, 3 (1973), 253-69.

of each verse and in the space beneath, sense changes signposted clearly throughout. This type of lay-out is peculiar to glossed books of the Bible. Such a presentation of the commentary brings to mind the *lectio divina* of the twelfth-century schools. There happen to be fifteenth-century marginalia which attest to a didactic usage. However, the actual quality of the manuscripts precludes an educational context. It is the finest twelfth-century copy to survive, with two elaborate illuminated initials and perfect parchment. Such features might suggest that it was a display copy, owned by some prestigious ecclesiastical institution. It is, however, a small book. Its quality and size might even indicate that it was owned by a nobleman or woman.

i. *Mise-en-Page*

Although *T3* is distinctive, it is not the only witness to present *Super Lamentationes* in the form of a marginal gloss. The thirteenth-century *D3* contains a glossed Lamentations, with Hugh's commentary added as an extra exposition, set out in its own column apart from the actual marginal gloss. It accompanies all of glossed Lamentations 1-5, and is continued in normal text-blocks once this is finished. Unlike *T3*, this is a messy, chaotic glossed copy, more likely to be the product of the school-room.

The commentary is, however, usually presented as a continuous piece of writing. Lemmata are sometimes signalled by markings in the margin or are highlighted within the text. Underlining is sometimes used for them, for example, in the thirteenth-century *P5* and *P6*, but only rarely in the twelfth century. The Victorine witness *V* places lemmata, or their openings, in capitals. Other manuscripts use a coloured initial to signal a lemma. Sometimes there is little or no distinction between the phrases from Lamentations which are being expounded and the exposition itself. This could partly be because Hugh frequently repeated lemmata, sometimes fusing them into his interpretations.

However, it was another type of division within the commentary which often interested scribes or subsequent correctors, namely the division of the text into its different senses. The headings *historialiter* (or *historice* or *historia*),

allegorice (or *allegoria*) and *moraliter* (or *moralis*), or more commonly their abbreviations, often figure in the margin or occasionally within the actual text itself. Red is sometimes used either for the whole heading or for its initial letter. Most of the twelfth-century manuscripts contain these division headings.⁵³⁹ However, there are some from this period which do not have such divisions, namely, the closely related *P2* and *P3*, as well as the main Θ witnesses (*Re*, *T1*, *T2*).

Where these sense headings are included, distribution of them is, however, not consistent. In some manuscripts they appear throughout, but others cease to employ them, in particular for the commentary which concerns the Second Lamentation, as is the case in *V* and *Val*. Some do not use them at every change of sense, adding them sporadically. One particular manuscript, *Di* seems to deploy headings abundantly.⁵⁴⁰ Interestingly, there is at times disagreement between manuscripts about which sense is being explored, but only in the part of the commentary which concerns the Second Lamentation, as in the following examples:⁵⁴¹

a). 270A (2:1): Alleg(oria)/(-ice) Ω *D1 H*] Mor(alis)/(-iter) *C G*

There is an understandable confusion here, as the allegorical interpretation of 2:1 does border on being tropological, given the topic of the fall and its consequences for the human soul.⁵⁴²

b). 274C (2:5): Hist(oria)/(-ialiter)/(-ice) *Ba C Di*] Alleg(oria)/(-ice) *P4*

A sense heading here, even though there is no change of verse (but rather a different interpretation of the same verse), marks this as a fresh section, which indeed it is. It is the opening of Hugh's treatment of the theme of God's rejection

⁵³⁹ *Ba*, *C*, *Di*, *D1*, *D2*, *E*, *H*, *O1*, *P1*, *P4*, *R1*, *T3*, *V* and *Val*.

⁵⁴⁰ See above pp.162-3.

⁵⁴¹ I do not here discuss the following instance: 279C: Mor(alitas)/(-iter)/(-is) *Ba C H P4*] Alleg(oria)/(-ice) *Di*. *Di* has a tendency to understand 'allegorical' in a broad sense. See above p.163.

⁵⁴² See above pp.66-72.

of the Jewish people.⁵⁴³ It is not a literal / historical interpretation in that it does not concern the specific Jews of 586 BC. One would rather expect it to be allegorical, in that the historical destruction of Jerusalem is understood as representing God's anger against the Jews after their denial of Christ. However, perhaps this was understood as an historical reality.

c). 278A (2:8): Hist(oria)/(-orialiter)/(-ice) *Ba H P4*] Alleg(oria)/(-ice) *C Di DI*

The error here can be explained by the fact that these verses had already been subjected to their literal reading (at 269A-B and 269D respectively). However, at this later point the threefold structure is resumed. Some manuscripts were understandably expecting the allegorical exposition.

d). 285C (2:11): Alleg(oria)/(-ice) *Ba DI DI H P4*] Hist(oria)/(-ice) Δ^1

286C: Hist(oria)/(-ice) *Ba DI DI H P4*] Alleg(oria)/(-ice) Δ^1

The mistake here is again explicable. For one would naturally expect this order of senses. However, the literal and allegorical are in fact reversed here.

It is clear that disagreement between manuscripts is caused by the structural complexity of certain parts of the commentary on Lamentations 2. In the case of 2:11, a certain arrangement was naturally expected, but this is upset. As regards 2:1-9, the threefold scheme has broken down. To recap briefly what has been amply discussed above, first 2:1-9 are interpreted *literally*, then verses 2:1-5 allegorically (though merging with the tropological), for 2:6-7, the allegorical sense alternates with the moral, finally at 2:8 the original order of literal, allegorical, then moral is resumed.

The confusion over these headings at certain points is revealing because it shows attempts to make sense of what was to a certain extent a disordered arrangement. Perhaps at the outset Hugh's commentary was unfinished or piecemeal in places. Divisions into senses where the structure had lost its clarity

⁵⁴³ See above pp.64-5.

may well represent a revision of the work. The Victorine manuscript only has headings in the exposition of Lamentations 1. For the second part there is only a sporadic use of *pieds de mouche*, and not consistently for changes of sense. I suspect that the original version lacked them and that they were introduced subsequently. However, it must be said that there was a swift move to do so, as a number of the earlier witnesses, notably, *DI* and *H* include them.

Later manuscripts mostly omitted the sense indications altogether. Notable exceptions are the Φ^4 witnesses from Flanders, *Br1*, *Eb* and *Wa*. Why it should be that the older manuscripts favoured them while posterior ones neglected them is hard to ascertain. This might raise the question of whether the exegetical character of the work, with its threefold division, interested twelfth-century readers more than it did later readers, and whether the presence of such headings point to a didactic interest in the text. To answer this one would need to study the treatment of other such texts.

ii. Additions to the Commentary

Evidence for reception of the commentary is contained in a number of manuscripts of the Φ group, in particular those of Φ^{1-3} . These add on preliminary material as though to fill a perceived gap: the exposition itself is preceded by the biblical text of Lamentations; following Lamentations, there are also extracts ascribed to Jerome on the significance of the Hebrew letters. Two initial points could be made about this group of manuscripts. One is that they present Hugh's commentary as accompanying the biblical text. This seems an obvious observation, but in the case of other manuscripts, one could be led to believe that this exposition was somehow removed from the biblical work being expounded, that it stood as a composition in its own right. The second point of interest is the fact that a need was felt early on to supplement Hugh's commentary, in this case with an account of the Hebrew letters and their interpretations. Every other medieval commentary on Lamentations included at least some reference to this aspect, but Hugh, as we have seen, ignored it. Both points possibly suggest

educational activity, with students and teachers studying the biblical text, rather than private reading of a devotional work in its own right.

The group of witnesses from Champagne (the Θ group) include a supplementation to the text. Excerpts from Paschasius Radbertus's commentary on Lamentations 1:4-22 are interpolated after Hugh's exposition of 1:3, that is to say, where he abandons Lamentations 1. The extract from Paschasius Radbertus ends with the rubric: 'Finit Paschasii. Item ex tractatu Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie Prophete' ('Here ends [the extracts] of Paschasius. [What follows is] again the treatise of Master Hugh on the Lamentations of Jeremiah').⁵⁴⁴ None of these manuscripts date from before the 1170s. This is without doubt a later modification of the commentary. It is an understandable interpolation. It indicates that Hugh's exposition was felt by some to be imperfect because of the lack of an exposition of Lamentations 1:4-22. But in none of these manuscripts is Paschasius Radbertus's commentary on Lamentations 3-5 added on to the end of Hugh's. What seemed to pose a problem was not that Hugh failed to expound all the chapters, but that he interrupted his commentary on Lamentations 1. Possibly it is surprising that this is the only group to fill this gap.

A further example of minor additions are the marginalia, generally by subsequent readers rather than the copyist himself. Although 'nota bene' signs abound in several witnesses, there are few marginal notes which suggest how the text was received. Those that occur tend to serve as pointers to the theme treated in the text, as in the case of *H*, which, for example, next to a reference to Jerusalem and Babylon, has a twelfth-century note in the margin which says, 'Due ciuitates'.

⁵⁴⁴ *T3* has a different note at this point. See above p.183.

iii. Title of the Work

The question of how this commentary was received and employed, may in some way be elucidated by the titles it bears. The critical apparatus gives a full enumeration of the various rubrics appended to the work.⁵⁴⁵ Above I suggested that there was originally no title.⁵⁴⁶ Hence the the array of possibilities, some of which reveal how this work was classified during the period. The term *tractatus* is used in over a third of the extant manuscripts, extending across groups. Such a designation suggests the discussion or treatment of a topic at some length. It may also seem to imply a work which is presenting dogma. In fact it was applied to other exegetical works, be they patristic, Carolingian or contemporary.⁵⁴⁷ It would be worth exploring whether the commentaries which are called *tractatus* share any characteristic, for example, a tendency to set forth doctrinal or discursive argument. In a few manuscripts, it is not *tractatus*, but *expositio* (and in one, *explanatio*), a word we would associate more closely with Scriptural exegesis. Other copies drop any such term as *treatise* or *exposition* and simply cite the commentator and the biblical text he is expounding, for example, ‘Magister Hugo super Lamentationes Ieremie’ (P4). Although the majority of extant manuscripts make no reference to the fact that this commentary is incomplete, three contain a note to that effect (P2, P3 and Φ^1). A few (P3, Val and Δ^1) include in the title to the work the specification that *Super Lamentationes* is interrupted, for instance, ‘Incipit tractatus Magistri Hugonis non tamen continuus’. There is only one example, dating from the thirteenth century, of a title which attempts to be more specific, revealing to the reader that Hugh’s exposition of Lamentations will employ the three senses: ‘Incipit expositio

⁵⁴⁵ See edition p.1.

⁵⁴⁶ See above p.251.

⁵⁴⁷ It would be worth checking editions or manuscripts of Lamentations commentaries by authors other than Hugh to see whether *tractatus* was used at all. N. Häring in his article ‘Commentaries and Hermeneutics’ in R. L. Benson and G. Constable (eds), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, p.175, draws attention to the use of *tractatus* for biblical commentaries, asking: ‘What was the reason for adopting the inscription *tractatus*?’ He does not answer this question, it seems to me. He does, however, argue that the exegetes themselves were not concerned about the titles of their commentaries. That may be so, but does the title not reveal to some extent how readers/users of the text characterized it?

Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie secundum triplicem intellectum, uidelicet historicum, allegoricum, moralem' (*Va2*).

We might conclude from some of the titles we have, with their inclusion of the word 'tractatus' or 'expositio', that the work was defined as a piece of biblical exegesis to be studied, as opposed to some more devotional text to be read aloud. Not that the term 'tractatus' precludes the latter. There would have been ample opportunity for the reading aloud of many such texts. We have seen above how a commentary on Lamentations was prescribed reading matter for the refectory in St Victor's customary, where it was referred to as an 'expositio'.⁵⁴⁸ If the different titles can in fact serve as evidence for anything, perhaps it is that the commentary had more than one function.

iv. Ascription of the Work.

A work's significance in the Middle Ages was often connected with its authorship. The more famous the author, the more respected the work. Let us therefore turn to the question of attribution, that is to say, to whom the text was ascribed and what title is given to him. Many manuscripts give the common title of 'Magister' to Hugh. Several just refer to 'Magister Hugo', as if it were obvious to whom this referred. Some specify where he was from, either mentioning the geographical place or the institution (*P2*, *P3*, *E* and *Ca2* of the Σ^2 set; *C*). In addition to those witnesses which have no title, two fifteenth-century manuscripts omit any ascription. The manuscripts of the Θ group appear to ascribe the commentary to Hugh of Fouilloy (*Re* explicitly) and another, *Ha*, names the author as 'Hugo de Billonio'. Presumably these misinterpret a 'Magister Hugo' of an exemplar. One fifteenth-century manuscript, *I*, claims that Gregory wrote the work. Thus, it was not universally known to have been composed by Hugh.

⁵⁴⁸ See above p.25.

v. Accompanying Works

Super Lamentationes was copied in a whole variety of manuscripts. Some were large collections of works by Hugh, others were miscellanies. An examination of the other texts with which Hugh’s commentary was copied or bound up with may offer further clues about its reception and use. However, it is best to be cautious in evaluating this evidence. There may not have been a conscious selection of texts. The arrangement may have been haphazard, dependent more on external factors such as what works were at hand to be copied, or, in the case of composite manuscripts, the size of the folios. Let us nonetheless consider what works accompany the commentary to see if any pattern emerges.

At one end of the spectrum, there are three examples of manuscripts apparently devoted to this one text (*Pl*, *T3* and *Val*). All of these date from the twelfth century, but none of them belong to the same group. They are all small in size, which would have facilitated private reading. Two of them at least come from religious, in particular Cistercian, contexts.

On the other hand, thirteen witnesses are in fact large collections of Hugh’s works. Their distribution in time is as follows:

- s.xii
- B*
- C*
- Di*
- D1*
- D2*
- J*
- O1*
- P8*
- V*

s.xiii

Le

P6

s.xiv

O2

Vn

It is noticeable that most of these collections date from the twelfth century. Later, the commentary tended to appear in manuscripts which contain works by sundry writers.

The unifying principle of some of these collections may simply be the intention of assembling a large number of his works into a volume. The nature of the texts may not have been a factor which affected the process of compilation. The Victorine manuscript exemplifies the various 'genres' of work which accompany the commentary. Its early items are the compositions of a schoolmaster of St Victor, including Hugh's treatises on geometry, grammar and philosophy, his manual for instructing novices and his famous pedagogical handbook.⁵⁴⁹ *Super Lamentationes* follows these educational works, although it is immediately preceded by some extracts from Hugh's large dogmatic treatise, *De sacramentis*. After the commentary come writings one would associate more with monastic rather than educational life. Mystical texts predominate, touching upon the vanity of the physical world,⁵⁵⁰ the nature of love within a religious context,⁵⁵¹ followed by a miscellany of devotional, homiletic, exegetical and dogmatic pieces. The exposition of Lamentations is the only work of extended verse-by-verse biblical exegesis.

None of the other collections of Hugh's works are on the same scale as V. Nevertheless, several of these manuscripts represent quite extensive collections. These vary in contents. In some, it is probable that a conscious selection has

⁵⁴⁹ *Practica geometrie; Epitoma Dindimi in philosophiam; De grammatica; Didascalicon; De institutione nouitiorum.*

⁵⁵⁰ *De uanitate mundi; De tribus diebus.*

⁵⁵¹ *Soliloquium de arrha anime; De laude caritatis; De substantia dilectionis.*

determined what works are gathered in a volume. *J* assembles major works, such as *De sacramentis*, *De archa Noe* and *In Hierarchiam celestem*. *Di* is devoted for the most part to short pieces of a type which suggests the concerns of the cloister. *O1*, copied probably upon Becket's request, contains Hugh's three main works of 'commentary', *In Ecclesiasten*, *Super Lamentationes* and *In Hierarchiam celestem*, as well as his most important 'mystical' exposition, *De archa Noe*. *C* has a distinctly exegetical character, including Hugh's two works concerning *lectio divina*, as well as two expositions, the *Notule in Pentateuchum* and *Super Lamentationes*. It is the only extant witness to contain both exegetical texts.

Conscious selection, however, is often hard to establish. A conclusion which can be drawn from these collections is that a whole variety of other texts by Hugh accompanied *Super Lamentationes*. More often than not, the works in these volumes are hard to categorize. Those we would now classify as educational, exegetical, dogmatic and contemplative stand side by side.

In several manuscripts, *Super Lamentationes* accompanies works by Richard. The most notable examples of this are *Ma*, which constitutes a large collection of texts by these two authors, designated by the running titles which mark first the section devoted to Richard, then that devoted to Hugh. In the twelfth century, we find Richard's *Beniamin minor* associated with *Super Lamentationes* in the Champagne manuscripts *Re*, *T1* and *T2*, as well as at the end of what at first appears to be a volume of works by Hugh, *P2*. Fifteenth-century *Eb* is a *de luxe*^{copy} of *Super Lamentationes* followed by Richard's *De mystico somnio Nabuchodonosor*. Clearly, these two Victorines became associated with one another, possibly seen as representing a strand of mystical thought linked with that institution. Interestingly, there are no extant manuscripts where *Super Lamentationes* accompanies works by Hugh's pupil, Andrew, famous for his biblical exegesis.

One particular text was often copied with the Lamentations commentary. Several manuscripts include *De clauastro anime* of Hugh of Fouillooy (d.c.1172), or sections of it. The earliest of these, *Re*, *T1* and *T2*, do not predate 1170. Three are from the thirteenth century (*M*, *Ma*, *W*): two from the fourteenth century (*O2* and *Vn*). The two latest manuscripts are collections of Hugh's works, which appear to

attribute *De claustro anime* to him as well.⁵⁵² The sixteenth-century catalogue of the library of St Victor attests to the presence of several copies of this work. At least two of these are ascribed to Hugh.⁵⁵³ Other works of Hugh of Fouilloy have been accorded the same false attribution.⁵⁵⁴ But this is not a one-way process. In the Champagne manuscripts which share a partial copy of *De claustro anime*, particularly in *Re, Super Lamentationes* is mistakenly ascribed to Hugh of Fouilloy.

Why these two came to be confused is an interesting question. Both were referred to a 'Magister Hugo'; both were regular canons.⁵⁵⁵ Indeed, it is their shared vocation which may connect the two figures. Hugh of Fouilloy was vocal as a regular canon, promoting the benefits of the regulated life of a religious community in his widely diffused *De claustro anime*,⁵⁵⁶ and warning against those vices to be avoided. A spirit of reform pervades this work.⁵⁵⁷

One can only speculate as to why *De claustro anime* becomes associated with *Super Lamentationes*. A simple explanation might be that both texts were copied largely in a monastic context. Another reason might be that both are reforming works. In *Super Lamentationes*, Hugh's correction of morals is, admittedly, more directed at the role of the priest in the outside world, whereas Hugh of Fouilloy is more inward looking, centering on the cloistered life and its vices. The latter does, nonetheless, have sections with titles such as 'Ut praelatus sit sapiens, non negligens' and 'De praelatis negligentibus'.⁵⁵⁸ A further connection between these two works is the theme of Jerusalem, for *De claustro anime*, 4 treats its mystical and moral symbolisms.⁵⁵⁹

It is not possible to explain why many of the works by authors other than Hugh, Richard and Hugh of Fouilloy, are joined with *Super Lamentationes*. It is

⁵⁵² In the case of *Vn*, I am basing this on the manuscript description.

⁵⁵³ *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de Saint-Victor de Claude de Grandrue 1514*, pp. 172-3 : HH2 (= Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 981) and HH3 (= Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 14872).

⁵⁵⁴ See I. Gobry, *Le 'De claustro anime' d'Hugues de Fouilloy* (Eklipta 74, N.P., 1995), pp. 16-19.

⁵⁵⁵ Hugh of Fouilloy was prior of St Nicholas de Regny and then St Laurent, both Augustinian houses near Amiens.

⁵⁵⁶ For its diffusion, see Gobry, pp. 36-43.

⁵⁵⁷ See Gobry, pp. 51-84.

⁵⁵⁸ Respectively, *De claustro anime*, 2.10 and 2.12 (PL 176, cols 1057B-1058C and 1058D-1061A).

⁵⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, cols 1131D-1182D.

certainly not confined to an 'exegetical' texts. For example, the copies from the West of England are for the most part homiletic in content. Broadly speaking, Hugh's *Super Lamentationes* was to be found with a variety of texts, but ones which, on the whole, belonged to a monastic milieu. Therefore, the context it is set within in the *Patrologia Latina* is misleading. For it is categorized there as an exegetical work, placed amongst his other commentaries, a clear misrepresentation when one compares it to the medieval manuscripts.

iii. Question of Cohesion

Two manuscripts (*L3* and *J*) contain Hugh's commentary on Lamentations 1 without that of Lamentations 2. *J* dates from the twelfth century. In the majority of manuscripts, however, both parts were copied together. Some manuscripts, such as *E* and *H*, mark no interruption in the work at the prologue to Lamentations 2, even though they both describe *Super Lamentationes* as 'non tamen continuus'. A few important witnesses, most notably *V*, present a division between the two parts. *P1*, *R1*, *P2* and *C* preface the commentary on Lamentations 2 with a note. But most witnesses hardly have any noticeable break, except that marked, in many cases, by a *littera notabilior*. The evidence indicates, therefore, that early in its history *Super Lamentationes* was circulating as one work. Titles such as 'tractatus' attest to the fact that it was, for the most part, regarded as a unified piece. Nevertheless, I believe that the division in *V* preserves the truth and that in fact *Super Lamentationes* does constitute two separate pieces by Hugh. It is possible that after Hugh's death, during the process of collecting together his compositions, the two became merged into one.

Conclusion

The study of the manuscript tradition of *Super Lamentationes* has shed light upon the significance of this text for medieval culture. It enjoyed a fairly substantial diffusion, as the fifty-five extant witnesses prove. Without doubt, more are yet to be unearthed. In the past three years alone, at least eight new copies have been added to the list that Rudolph Goy compiled in 1976. This growing number suggests that *Super Lamentationes* is a work worthy of some attention, even if it was not as frequently copied as several other of Hugh's writings, such as *De sacramentis*, *Didascalicon* and *De arrha anime*. Moreover, it was disseminated fairly widely early on, by the mid-twelfth century reaching southern Austria and spreading rapidly throughout England. In the following century, travelling friars carried it into central Italy. It was not only monastic libraries which housed Hugh's commentary; it was also to be found in the scholastic world of Parisian friars. It also appears likely that a copy of the text was owned by a layperson. It would, therefore, be wrong to assume that it was a work confined to a specific area of transmission or to one institutional setting.

Nevertheless, the provenances that can be identified indicate that its audience was predominantly monastic. This should come as no surprise. The subject-matter of Lamentations suited such a milieu, given the *topos* of monks lamenting the world. In *Super Lamentationes*, the vivid image of the soul assailed by vice and the strong criticism of malpractice within the Church made it an appealing text to read in the cloister. Hugh of Fouilloy's *De claustro anime* was another work by a regular canon which attracted this same readership. As we have seen, in several manuscripts both these works were copied together.

The Cistercians in particular played an active role in spreading the work. Their motivation might partly have been a general zeal to copy works by Hugh. But I would argue that they had a specific interest in the text. It is no accident that two of the small volumes which contain *Super Lamentationes* alone come from Cistercian centres. Nor is it chance that *Super Lamentationes* has pride of place as the opening work in the copy from Cîteaux, in which it is by far the longest piece and marked with accents to facilitate public reading.

It was not just in the cloister, however, that this work had significance. A few witnesses present it as though it were a school gloss to be read as part of Bible study. Glosses tended to be taken from patristic and Carolingian sources. *Super Lamentationes* was thus imparted a kind of special authority. It is a doubly striking presentation of the work, given that Hugh differed greatly from figures such as Gilbert the Universal in the individuality of his commentary.

Is it possible, then, to sum up the medieval reception of *Super Lamentationes*? It is hard to determine a single usage for this work. It was doubtless material for public reading within a religious community. It probably had some use as a private devotional text. But it also served at times as a study aid for *lectio divina* in the class-room. Furthermore, it may have been a source for preachers, as perhaps exemplified by the small portable copy which was borne to Abruzzo by a friar. The safest conclusion to draw is that *SuperLamentationes* had a variety of uses, as indeed did many works of exegesis. The classification of the text as exegetical in the *Patrologia Latina*, as though there was a genre of 'exegesis', is misleading. Just as the themes in *Super Lamentationes* cross boundaries, so do the functions it served.

The manuscript evidence also reveals that this text in particular had a certain 'malleability' about it. It was at times tampered with: prefaced by the biblical text of Lamentations and interpretations of the Hebrew letters in the case of one set of manuscripts; complemented by the addition of excerpts from Paschasius in another; structured by means of varying sense headings in others. The first instance implies a process of normalization. Hugh departed from tradition in excluding the significance of the Hebrew alphabet. The other two strongly suggest that, in the face of a composition which was not cohesive and was, in part at least, beset with structural inconsistency, attempts were made to unify and order the material. In other words, it was not only the usage of *Super Lamentationes* which was diverse; the way in which it was read and understood was also subject to variation.

Where there is agreement between at least some of the manuscripts is the designation of this commentary as a *tractatus*. This term is shared by witnesses belonging to all the different groups. Hugh's discursive treatment of his material

possibly suggested such a title to some of his audience. Further study of the sense of *tractatus* is, however, required before any firm claims can be made about its significance.

How Hugh's work was received and what Hugh himself was doing are clearly distinct areas. In this final chapter, I have gathered evidence for what subsequent readers made of this work. But I have also attempted to draw closer to Hugh's text by peeling away the layers built up by the manuscript tradition: the errors, omissions, emendations and idiosyncracies. The results of this process are here presented in my partial edition of *Super Lamentationes*. It is to be hoped that this interesting work is now in a position to receive further scholarly attention.

Sigla for Manuscripts

B	Bruges, Openbare Bibliotheek, 153A, s.xii (Φ^3)
Ba	Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, 385, s.xiii (Φ^4)
Br1	Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert 1er, 2183 (1557-1604), s.xv (Φ^4)
Br2	Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert 1er, 1872 (168-94), s.xv/xvi
C	Charleville, Bibliothèque municipale, 166a, s.xii (Φ^3)
Ca1	Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, 71, s.xii/xiii (Δ^2)
Ca2	Cambridge, University Library, Ee. VI. 27, s.xv (Σ^2)
D1	Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 363, s.xii (Φ^2)
D2	Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 364, s.xii (Φ^2)
D3	Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 27, s.xiii (Φ^2)
Di	Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, 69, s.xii (Ω)
E	Eton College Library, 38, s.xii (Δ^1)
Eb	Edinburgh, University Library, 70, s.xv (Φ^4)
G	Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 212, s.xii (Δ^2)
H	Hereford Cathedral Library, O. 2. VIII, s.xii (Δ^1)
Ha	The Hague, 71. J. 63, s.xii/xiii
L1	London, British Museum, Add. 19885, s.xii/xiii (Σ^2)
L2	London, British Museum, Royal 5.E.XIV, s.xiii (Σ)
Le	Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Theol. 395, s.xiii
Li	Lisbon, Biblioteca Nacional, Alcobaca 242, s.xiii (Θ)
Ma	Mâcon, Bibliothèque de la ville, 84, s.xiii (Σ^1)
Mu	Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 26818, s.xv (Σ^1)
N	Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, VII. D. 33, s.xiii (Φ)
O1	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 345, s.xii (Ω)
O4	Oxford, Merton College, 49, s.xv (Δ^2)
P1	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2912, s.xii (Φ^1)
P2	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 2527, s.xii (Σ^2)
P3	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 1917, s.xii (Σ^2)
P4	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 13416, s.xii (Φ^4)

- P5** Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 15256, s.xiii (Φ^2)
- P7** Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 1778, s.xiv (Ω)
- R1** Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 437, s.xii (Φ^1)
- R2** Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 551, s.xiii (Φ^1)
- Re** Rheims, Bibliothèque municipale, 446, s.xii (Θ)
- T1** Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 558, s.xii (Θ)
- T2** Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 637, s. xii (Θ)
- T3** Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 1044, s.xii (Θ)
- V** Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 717, s.xii (Σ^1)
- Va1** Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, Ross. 227, s.xii (Σ)
- Va2** Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, Ottob. lat. 103, s.xiii (Δ^2)
- Vn** Valencia, Biblioteca de la Catedral, 52, s.xiv
- W** Worcester, Chapter Library, Ch. 48, s.xiii (Δ^1)
- Wa** Washington, Library of Georgetown University, 12, s.xiv/xv (Φ^4)

Incomplete text

- M** Montpellier, Ecole de médecine, 413, s.xii/xiii (Φ)
- S** Soissons, Bibliothèque municipale, 130, s.xv (Θ)

Lamentations 1

- J** Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 729, s.xii
- L3** London, Wellcome Historical Medical Library, 801A, s.xiii
- P8** Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 2530, s.xii (short extract)

Abridgement

I	Innsbruck, Universitätsbibliothek, 98, s.xv (Δ^2)
O2	Oxford, New College, 144, s.xiii/xiv (Σ^2)
O3	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 897, s.xiii (Φ^2)
P6	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 16369, s.xiii
Pr	Prague, University Library, 192, s.xiv/xv (Φ^4)
Su	Subiaco, Santa Scolastica, 289, s.xiv
Vi	Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1602, s.xv (Δ^2)

Notes on Edition

- Italicization has been used only when words are cited as lemmata.
- Orthography: ‘e’ is used for ‘ae’ and ‘oe’.
- The source apparatus includes only references to Paschasius Radbertus.
- The critical apparatus uses *pat.* as an abbreviation of *Patrologia Latina*.

1:1 255D *Quomodo sedet sola ciuitas plena populo?* Quantum ad litteram spectat, desolationem Ierusalem plangit Ieremias, et est admirantis uel dolentis uox ista. Ideo autem ab admiratione inchoat, ut magnitudinem calamitatis ostendat
5 ac per hoc attentos faciat auditores, ut in quibus sint malis agnoscant et ad penitentiam conuertantur.

Quomodo sedet sola ciuitas plena populo? **256D** Quasi diceret: ‘Ciuitas que olim in tempore Daud et aliorum bonorum regum qui Deo placuerunt, plena populo fuit, attendite quare nunc sola remansit.’ Cur enim nisi quia Deum
10 offenderunt? ‘Solam’ autem dicit, hoc est desolatam propter populum abductum, captiuatum in Babylonem. Vel si ad idem tempus referatur, plena populo est et tamen sola sedet, quia Deum propitium non habet, quoniam prodesse non potest multitudo populi ubi deest auxilium Dei. **257A** Quod autem dicit ‘sedet’ ad deiectionem pertinet et humiliationem.

3. admirantis uel dolentis: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1063C, 1106B, 1116B

1. Titulum om. G Ma P7 S V

tractatus Δ^1 Θ (*excepto S*) B Ba Br1 Br2 D1 D2 Le O1 P1 P2 P3 P5 Va1 Wa] om. Ha M Ma O2 O3 P4 Pr T3 Vi, expositio C Ca L1 L2 Mu N O4 R1 Va2, explanatio Di, commentum Eb, Adnotatiunculae Elucidatoriae pat.

Magistri Hugonis] om. Le Vi, eiusdem O1, Magistri om. M Ma O2 P6 Pr, uenerabilis Br2 Mu, de Sancto Victore uel sim. add. Br Eb M Mu O3 P2 Wa, Parisi(ac)ensis addunt C E P2 P3, de Folieto prioris canonicorum Sancti Laurentii in pago Ambianensi Re, de Billonio Ha Lamentationes] Threnos uel sim. Ma Mu Pr Vi pat.

Titulo addunt non tamen continuus uel sim. Δ^1 P3 Va1, quedam pars L1 L2, ante titulum addunt Sciendum est quod in hoc uolumine non describit Magister Hugo nisi tres primas litteras primi alphabeti et secundum ex integro P1 R1 in marg. P2, secundum triplicem intellectum uidelicet historicum, allegoricum, moralem Va2, secundum multiplicem sensum et primo secundum litteralem pat.

3. est] om. Σ^1

4 autem] om Le P5 Pr

Facta est quasi uidua domina gentium: hoc est uiuente adhuc uiro suo derelicta, et ideo non uidua sed quasi uidua, quia si penituerit, adhuc reconciliari poterit. Propterea uero Deus uir dicitur plebis illius, quia eam ad cultum suum casto sibi amore copulauerat, ne per uarias idolorum culturas fornicaretur.

5 *Facta est quasi uidua domina gentium. Princeps prouinciarum facta est sub tributo*. Sic erat olim quod gentes alienigenarum seruiebant Iudeis, et prouincie nationum subdite erant illis. Nunc uero ipsi a Deo derelicti tributarii facti sunt nationibus. **257B** Commemoratio igitur prioris glorie presentis miserie est exaggeratio.

10 Secundum allegorie sensum Ieremias in Ecclesia quoslibet spirituales uiros designat, qui cum uideant multitudinem hominum ad fidem confluxisse et nomen Christi per totum pene mundum dilatatum esse, nullos autem uel admodum paucos inueniant qui in ueritate Christum sequantur et sincere fidem eius teneant, omnibus que sua sunt querentibus, dolentes et gementes dicunt:

1/2. uiuente...quasi uidua: cf. Pasch. *In Lam.* 1065B

9. exaggeratio: Pasch. *In Lam.* 1063D

4. sibi] *om. Br Eb L3 O3*

8. Commemoratio] *Commeratio Ma O4 V*

9. exaggeratio] *exaugeratio P6, aggregatio $\Phi^1 B Br Eb G M O2 Pr Wa$, aggeratio P4, aggrauatio Φ^2*

Quomodo sedet sola ciuitas plena populo? Vtquid tantum in Ecclesia populum cernimus et tamen solam esse Ecclesiam uidemus? Quia uix aliquem qui uere cum Ecclesia sit inuenire possumus. **257C** Simile quiddam in Euangelio repperi. Constituto in turba Domino, undique circumuallante et premente se populo, uenit
5 mulier fluens sanguine et *accedens retro tetigit fimbriam uestimenti eius*. Et ille confestim: ‘Quis’, inquit, ‘tetigit me? Tetigit me aliquis.’ Quia qui muliere fimbriam contingente quasi nouum aliquid passus interrogat, ‘Quis me tetigit?’, profecto declarat quod prius quamuis cunctis impingentibus et prementibus tactus non fuerit. Sicut ergo Christus turba premente intactus permanet, ita Ecclesia,
10 corpus Christi, inter multos sola sedet, quia fides catholica professores multos habet, imitatores paucos, sicut et tunc qui Domino prope erant per presentiam corporalem, non eum contingere poterant, quia longe erant per fidem et dilectionem. **257D** Plangit ergo spiritualis Ieremias et dicit: ‘Quomodo sedet sola ciuitas plena populo?’ Quia ubicunque serui Dei sunt, sine dolore et gemitu hec
15 uidere non possunt.

4/8. Constituto...tetigit: cf. Marc. 5:24/34; accedens...eius: Matth. 9:20, Marc. 5:27, Luc.8:44; quis me tetigit: Marc. 5:31.

2. solam esse Ecclesiam] solam Ecclesiam esse *Br1 Eb G L3 Wa*, esse *om.* Σ^2

3. repperi] repperimus Θ

4. populo] turba Φ

6. tetigit me] me tetigit *Ba Br1 Eb M Mo O3 R1 Wa*

8. impingentibus] impungentibus *L3*, pungentibus *pat.*, imprimantibus *M*

10. sola sedet] sedet sola Φ

14. hec] hoc $\Phi^3 D1 Le P5$, sed *N*

Facta est quasi uidua domina gentium. Princeps prouinciarum facta est
sub tributo. Per gentes recte accipimus carnales quosque intra Ecclesiam positos,
 per prouincias uero quoscunque extra Ecclesiam constitutos, sicut sunt pagani,
 Iudei et heretici. Tunc ergo sancta Ecclesia domina est gentium, quando carnales
 5 quosque intus positos per discipline rigorem ad seruiendum subicit. Princeps
 prouinciarum est quando extra positos infideles per potentiam, ne nocere possint,
 repellit. **258A** Sed si quando forte peccatis exigentibus a Deo derelinquitur,
 quatenus nec eos qui intus turbant cohibere ualeat, nec ab his qui se foris
 impugnant defendere, tunc domina gentium quasi uidua relinquitur, et princeps
 10 prouinciarum efficitur tributaria. Quando enim fideles uel ab hereticis deceptos uel
 a potestatibus huius mundi premio siue terrore fractos ad infidelitatem trahi
 conspicit, quid aliud quam alienigenis tributum soluit?

Secundum intellectum moralem, ciuitas significat animam, que sola sedet
 quando a Deo derelinquitur, plena autem populo uirtutum quando a Deo
 15 inhabitatur. Si autem ciuitatem inuenimus cuius desolatio plangitur, ubi

7. peccatis exigentibus: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1064D; 1065C; 1066B; 1069C

14/15. quando...inhabitatur: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1065C

6. potentiam] penitentiam Δ^1 a.c. E W

7. si quando forte] si forte quando *pat.*, forte *om.* Θ

12. soluit] soluitur Δ^1

13. significat] figurat Φ^1

14. autem] uero Φ^4 D I

15. cuius desolatio plangitur] cuius plangitur desolatio Ω Ma

Ieremias inuenitur? Vnusquisque nostrum debet esse Ieremias et plangere desolationem suam, quemadmodum ille plangebat desolationem Ierusalem. **258B** Et certe si ille sic plangebat ruinam lapidum, nos multo magis plangere debemus desolationem animarum nostrarum et dicere unusquisque: ‘Quomodo sedet sola
5 ciuitas plena populo? Quomodo anima mea desolata est? Quomodo bonum illum habitatorem perdidit, quo presente olim plena populo uirtutum fuit?’

Facta est quasi uidua domina gentium. Gentes sunt desideria carnis que nobis secundum corruptionem prime natiuitatis ingenita sunt et legi mentis contradicunt, quibus tunc bene anima dominatur quando Deo perfecte subicitur.
10 *Princeps prouinciarum sub tributo.* Per prouincias accipere possumus sensus corporeos, quia sicut in una prouincia multi sunt homines, ita quisque sensuum diuersos habet motus et diuersas operationes per quas foris in uisibilibus diffunditur. Et dum singulorum sensuum appetitus ad nutum rationis mouentur, quasi quibusdam prouinciis anima principatur. **258C** Si ergo anima suo inferiori,
15 hoc est sensualitati principari desiderat, necesse est ut suo superiori, hoc est Deo se subiciat, quia nequaquam subtus se a suo inferiori turbare poterit, dum

2. suam] sui *pat.*.

3. nos] *om.* Φ^4

4. desolationem] ruinam Φ^1

5. mea] nostra Φ^{1-3} *N Re*

5/6. bonum illum habitatorem perdidit] illum bonum habitatorem perdidit Δ^1 *L2 N O2 Re Va2*, bonum habitatorem illum perdidit Ω , bonum illum perdidit habitatorem *P2 P3*, habitatorem bonum illum *Va1*

9. subicitur] subiciuntur Ω , subditur *O2*

12. diuersos habet motus et diuersas operationes] diuersos motus et diuersas operationes habet Θ

13. diffunditur] diuiditur Σ^2 *p.c. E*

supra se Deum rectorem habebit. Si uero oblita timoris Domini secuta fuerit concupiscentias suas, aufert Deus gratiam suam ab ea et tunc ex necessitate desideriiis carnis sue eneruiter succumbit que prius, cum Deo subiecta esset et ab ipso regeretur, suorum sensuum appetitus ad imperium rationis potenter strinxit.

5 **258D** Et nota quod dixit ‘domina’ non ‘princeps gentium’ et ‘princeps’, non ‘domina prouinciarum’, quia uitia, que naturalia non sunt, comprimi debent. sensus quia naturales sunt, non comprimi sed regi necesse habent, ut in illis extirpandis homo esse studeat districtus, in istis moderandis et custodiendis discretus. Sed fit nonnunquam ut dum homo illicitis carnis sue desideriiis resistere

10 et motus sensuum suorum custodire negligit, ita tandem praua consuetudine illigetur, ut postmodum etiam uolens eisdem resistere non possit. Quando ergo uitiiis inuitus seruire cogitur quibus prius sponte consensit, quid aliud quam prae consuetudini tributum soluit? Tria ergo anime bona et tria mala enumerauit. Bona: ciuitas plena populo, domina gentium, princeps prouinciarum. Mala: sola, uidua,

15 tributaria. **259A** Sed uideamus primum quomodo bona obtineat, postea quomodo

1. Deum rectorem Ω D1 N O3 R1] rectorem Deum *cett.*, Deum suum rectorem L1 L2 O2 fuerit] sit *pat.*

3. carnis sue] *om.* Σ (*excepto* L2)

5. dixit] dicit *pat.*

7. Sensus C Re] *addunt* autem Mu P7 R1, uero O3, enim *cett.*

8. esse studeat] studeat esse $\Sigma^2 \Phi^4 B$

9. illicitis] licitis *pat.*

11. illigetur] alligetur *pat.*

 eisdem] eis G P7
 u. h. is] *om.* Δ a.c. E
 inuitus Δ a.c. E] *om. cett.*

13. Bona] Bona sunt *pat.*

15. quomodo...quomodo] quando...quando Θ , quando...quomodo Re, que nam...que nam Le, quot...quot Va2

 postea quomodo] quomodo *om.* Δ^1 Mu a.c. E

ad mala descendat. Priusquam Spiritus Sanctus ueniat ad cor nostrum, sterilis est anima nostra. Cum autem uenerit, fecundat eam ut pariat et nascantur uirtutes in ea. Que uidelicet uirtutes, quandiu adhuc imperfecte sunt et incipientes et necdum foras prodire possunt, sed intrinsecus adhuc per gratiam eiusdem Spiritus
5 nutriuntur, ut crescant et robuste fiant, quid aliud quam paruuli quidam in domo patris educantur, donec ad legitimam etatem perueniant? Cum uero ad perfectum uenerint incrementum, et solido quodam sapientie cibo uti ceperint, tunc iam non ut paruuli in domo patris nutrirī indigent, sed quasi quidam populus in ciuitate sub
10 lege imperatoris sui uiuere debent. **259B** Sed cum Deus intus presidens nos regit, tunc caro subiecta foris seruit et quanto humilīus ei intus subdimur, tanto robustius foris principamur. Sic ergo anima nostra intus plena populo uirtutum quando Deum regem habuit, extra etiam domina gentium, hoc est carnalium desideriorum, et prouinciarum, hoc est sensuum corporis princeps fuit. Nunc autem sola quia regem perdidit, uidua quia maritum amisit, tributaria quia uitiis
15 subiecta seruit.

2. nascantur *H Va2 W pat.*] nascuntur *cett.*

3/4. adhuc imperfecte sunt et incipientes et necdum foras prodire possunt sed intrinsecus] *om. Δ¹*

a.c. E

5. paruuli quidam in domo patris] paruuli quidam adhuc in domo patris *Φ*

8. in domo patris] *om. Σ pat. del. E*

quasi] quasi ut *pat.*

10. ei intus subdimur] intus ei subdimur *Θ Ω, intus om. Ba Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

11. Sic] Si *pat.*

12. Deum regem *Φ³ Ca2 L1 L2 O2 P3 R1*] regem Deum *cett.*

habuit] habuerit *Di Le P2 P3*

14. uitiis] intus *Σ²*

seruit] seruiuit *Ca Va1*, fuit *Φ² D1 M* (*add. uel seruit sup. l. D1*)

1:2. *Plorans plorauit in nocte.* Inculcatio uerbi abundantiam doloris designat. *Plorans plorauit in nocte:* hoc est in tempore quietis, in tempore obliuionis, quando solent homines obliuisci malorum suorum. Et attendite quanta sit miseria illius, cui et tunc dolores deesse non possunt, quando alii a doloribus requiescunt.

5 **259C** *Et lacrimae eius in maxillis eius.* Est aliquando dolor qui quomodocunque cor tangit, sed lacrimas extorquere non sufficit. Non est talis dolor huius: ‘lacrimae eius in maxillis eius.’

Non est qui consoletur eam ex omnibus caris eius: uel quia in tribulatione positam contempnunt, uel quia in tanto malo subuenire non possunt. Caros autem
10 populi illius uocat prophetas et principes, qui consolari eam consueuerant, prophete a Deo promittendo auxilium, et principes contra inimicos pugnando et patriam defendendo. Nunc autem plebem in tribulatione positam minime consolabantur, quia et illi Deum iratum predicabant et isti inimicis regionem uastantibus et populum captiuantibus resistere non poterant.

5. lacrimae eius] eius *om.* Δ *Mu a.c. E*

6. talis] *om.* Δ^1 *a.c. E*

7. huius] eius Σ^2 *Val p.c.E*

10. eam Φ *Re*] eos *cett.*

11. pugnando] purgando *pat.*

14. poterant] ualebant *Br1 Eb Wa*

259D Vel aliter legi potest ‘plorans ploravit in nocte’: hoc est in secreto,
 in abscondito, quod amicum est flentibus qui consolari nolunt, sed pascuntur
 doloribus suis. Vel ideo plebs in captiuitate posita in abscondito plorat, quia
 tristitiam suam manifestare non audet propter crudeles dominos quibus subiecta
 5 est, ne erga se maiorem eorum excitaret iracundiam, si de sua seruitute tristis
 appareret. Sed tantus dolor abscondi non potest, quia ‘lacrimae eius in maxillis
 eius’, hoc est in aperto, in manifesto, quia ex assiduitate flendi facies intumuit. Et
 in tantis malis istis quam consolationem expectare poterant, quibus etiam cari sui
 consolationem non ferunt?

10 **260A** *Omnes amici eius spreuerunt eam.* Per amicos intelligi uult finitimas
 nationes olim federe iunctas populo Iudeorum, qui nunc in pressuris constitutum
 non solum spreuerunt auxilium non ferendo, sed etiam inimici facti sunt
 persequendo.

3. in captiuitate posita: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1066B

2. amicum est] est amicum *LI P2 P3*, amatum [amicum] *pat.*
 4. subiecta] subdita $\Phi^1 \Phi^{3-4} G Le N$
 5. eorum] *om.* ΩG
 8. quibus] cui *Br1 Eb Wa*
 cari sui] carissimi *pat.*
 9. ferunt] conferunt Θ
 11. nationes] regiones *T2 T3*
 in pressuris] impressuris *O4 P3 V Val*

Secundum sensum allegorie nox sunt peccatores, maxille uero predicatorum qui cibum uerbi Dei exponendo comminuunt, et sic ad infirmos et sensu hebetes transmittunt. Quando ergo Ecclesia in hoc presentis uite exilio in membris suis perfectioribus lapsus infirmantium plorat, quasi plebs in captiuitate posita per noctem lacrimas in maxillis portat. Vel nox hanc ipsam qua uiuimus presentem uitam significare potest, quando adhuc ad inuicem conscientias nostras non uidemus. **260B** Et sicut supradiximus, maxille significant illos qui scientiam uerbi Dei habent. Tunc ergo sancta Ecclesia per noctem lacrimas in maxillis portat, quando perfecti quique quanto uicinius per illuminationem mentis diem eternitatis conspiciunt, tanto magis presentis uite tenebras plangunt secundum sententiam Salomonis qua dicit: 'Qui addit scientiam, addit dolorem.'

11. Qui...dolorem: Eccle. 1:18

1. nox sunt peccatores: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1068B

1/2. maxille...predicatores: cf. Greg., *Mor.* 2.12.15; Pasch., *In Lam.* 1067A

3/4. Quando...portat: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1067D-1068A

6/7. presentem...uidemus: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1066D

9/10. quando...plangunt: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1067D

3. ergo] uero *pat.*

5. hanc] *om.* Θ *M*

6. significare] figurare Φ^1

ad] *om.* *M pat.*

7. sicut] ut Δ^1

significant] figurant Φ^2

10. presentis uite tenebras] de presentis uite tenebris *Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

11. dolorem] et dolorem *Ba N O3 P2 P3 p.c. E*, laborem *G Re Tl*

Non est qui consoletur eam ex omnibus caris eius. Caros Ecclesie eosdem peccatores accipimus, quos supra per noctem significari dicebamus, quos profecto dum plangit diligit, quia nequaquam de eorum perditione plangeret, nisi salutem eorum et conuersionem amaret. **260C** Sed tunc ab his consolationem nullam
5 accipit, quando nullus eorum ad penitentiam redit, quia consolatio flentium esset conuersio peccatorum. Vel cari Ecclesie sunt illi beati angelici spiritus uel anime sanctorum, ad quorum consortium de huius exilii nocte suspirat, qui ei tunc consolationem non ferunt, dum eam adhuc a sua societate peregrinari sinunt.

De qua adhuc subditur: *Omnes amici eius spreuerunt eam.* Quos hic
10 amicos Ecclesie dicit, nisi potentes huius seculi, qui nonnunquam dum temporaliter sublimatam uident, honorant et se diligere fingunt, sed dum in pressuris constitutam aspiciunt, persequuntur et spernunt.

260D Secundum moralem sensum habet anima diem suum, habet noctem suam. Diem habet quando in lucem contemplationis erigitur, noctem habet quando
15 temptationum caligine tenebratur. Sed in die ridet, in nocte plorat, quia mens

6/7. Vel cari...sanctorum: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1068A

2. peccatores] pastores *H a.c.E W*
significari] significare *pat.*

4. tunc] *om. Δ¹ a.c. E*
his] illis *pat.*

6. beati] boni *Br1 Eb Wa*

10. qui] quia *P2 P3*

11. se] sic *Σ²*

11-12. in pressuris] impressuris *O4 P3 V*

12. aspiciunt] conspiciunt *pat.*
spernunt] spernuntur *pat.*

que temptationum pondere pressa gemit, subleuata postmodum in gaudio
contemplationis hilaescit. Plorat ergo anima in nocte quando tenebrosam intus
conscientiam salubri dolore compungit. Lacrimas in maxillis fert quando districta
foris castigatione carnem affligit. Tunc enim lacrimae in maxillis sunt, quando
5 dolores cordis usque ad macerationem carnis perueniunt. De quo ad maiorem
adhuc doloris exaggerationem subiungitur: *Non est qui consoletur eam ex
omnibus caris eius.* **261A** Tribus modis homo a Deo derelinquitur. Aliquando
intus et non foris, aliquando foris et non intus, aliquando et foris et intus. Foris et
non intus derelictus fuit Iob, qui exterius flagella carnis sustinuit, sed intus
10 constantiam mentis non amisit. Intus et non extra derelictus fuit Daud, cuius
mentem intus sibi libido per consensum subdidit, sed prophetica foris admonitio
ad penitentiam reuocauit. Intus et extra derelictus fuit prodigus ille in Euangelio
filius, qui et luxuriose uiuens intus defluxit et fame tabescens, foris consolationem
non inuenit. Sed quos hoc modo Deus deserit, alios ad probationem deserit, ut per
15 temptationem exerceantur, alios ad subuersionem deserit ut per temptationem
deiciantur. Propter quod et Psalmista precatur: ‘Ne declines in ira a seruo tuo.’
261B Quasi diceret: ‘Et si me temptari permittis, ne dimittas in temptationem

16. Ps. 26: 9

6. doloris exaggerationem: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1063D

5. usque] *om.* Φ

8. aliquando et] et *om.* Ba Le N P5 Wa

10. non extra] non foris Θ *add.* uel extra *sup.* l. T3

11. prophetica foris admonitio] prophetica admonitio foris Ca2 L2 O2, foris *om.* P2 P3 Val

12. extra] foris *pat.*

14. inuenit] Derelinquere autem dico ad temptandum concedere, quia nec diabolus ullatenus hominem
temptare preualeret, nisi prius temptandi licentiam a Deo accepisset *add.* Θ (uide p.xxx)

Sed] Si Br1 Wa

induci,' hoc est, a temptatione superari. Sed quia diuinorum iudiciorum
 profunditatem homo penetrare non potest, tunc magis quisque in temptatione
 positus in ira se derelictum esse pertimescit, cum et intus et foris temptationibus
 sollicitari se conspicit. Facilius autem aduersa foris tolerat cuius conscientiam
 5 intus delectatio peccati non conturbat. Et rursus facilius intus temptationem
 sustinet, qui foris consolationem habet. Vnde et magna tribulatio huius ostenditur,
 que et intus et foris derelicta esse demonstratur. Hoc namque quod dictum est,
 'Plorans plorauit in nocte et lacrimae eius in maxillis eius', intus derelictam esse
 insinuat; quod uero dictum est, 'Non est qui consoletur eam ex omnibus caris
 10 eius', foris desolatam esse declarat.

261C Sequitur: *Omnes amici eius spreuerunt eam et facti sunt ei inimici.*
 Videte quam multe sint tribulationes iustorum. Fortassis parum erat in pressuris
 constituto quod consolationem a caris non acciperet, nisi etiam ab amicis
 persecutionem sustineret. Sed qui sunt amici isti qui nos persequuntur, nisi illi de
 15 quibus dicitur in Euangelio: 'Inimici hominis domestici eius'? Ergo isti sunt inimici
 nostri, persecutores nostri: domestici nostri, amici nostri secundum carnis

15. Inimici...eius: Matth. 10:36

1. a] de Θ

2. magis] maxime *pat.*

3. in ira] *om. Br1 C Eb P4 Wa pat.*, intra Φ¹⁻² B Ba M N, iure Δ¹ *a.c.E*

aduersa foris tolerat] aduersa tolerat foris *a.c. Ba*, foris *om. Br1 Eb Mu Wa*, foris aduersa tolerat *pat.*

6. et magna] et *om. Θ*

huius] *om. Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

7. demonstratur] monstratur *Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

12. sint] *om. Φ*

in pressuris] impressuris V *Val*

13. constituto] constitutae *pat.*

15. dicitur] dicit *cett.*, dicetur *pat.*

affinitatem, nobis propinqui, qui nos per amorem carnis ad uitam presentem diligunt, sed ambulantes in uia Dei contradicunt. Cum enim ab amore huius mundi nos elongare cupimus, confestim eos qui prius amici uidebantur, aduersarios inuenimus. **261D** Primum si quidem ad Deum conuerti uolentes sub
5 obtentu pestifere dilectionis blandis persuasionibus reuocare contendunt. Quod si in proposito bono fixos et immobiles uiderint, mox quasi aduersarios abdicant et spernunt, et nonnunquam etiam odiis atrocissimis insectando et penis affligendo, de falsis amicis ueri persecutores fiunt. Dicat ergo: ‘Non est qui consoletur eam ex omnibus caris eius’, quia in tribulatione uerba iustorum ad consolationem
10 accipere non meretur. ‘Omnes amici eius spreuerunt eam et facti sunt ei inimici’, quia ab iniquis contemptum et contumeliam patitur.

1:3 262A *Migrauit Iudas*. Transiuit, recessit, fugit de terra sua in Babylonem, quia sustinere non poterat multam seruitutem, qua affligebatur a nationibus,
15 reputans tolerabilius sibi fore, si uni genti seruiret in terra aliena, quam si omnibus gentibus preda esset in propria.

4. uolentes] cupientes Φ

5. Quod] Quos *R1 pat.*

8. fiunt] efficiuntur Φ^4 , sunt Δ^1 *a.c. E*

10. accipere] recipere Φ^1

meretur] merentur Φ^1 *G*

11. iniquis] antiquis *H Va2 W a.c. E*

contumeliam] contumelias Ω

15. reputans] existimans *pat.*

Habitaui inter gentes nec inueni requiem. Proprium est afflictorum quod semper presens periculum grauius iudicant, sicut egroti in nocte diem expectant, et in die noctem desiderant, et dum semper dolorem transire cupiunt, semper ad dolorem tendunt. Sic nimirum populus iste, dum in terra sua affligeretur, fugam
5 appetiit, dum uero in exilio desolatus esset et uagus, oberrans, requiem inuenire non posset, ad reditum suspirauit. Exprimit autem hic affectum fluctuantium, non quia sponte migrauerint, sed quia in angustia constituti in diuersa uota mentem mutauerint.

262B *Omnes persecutores eius apprehenderunt eam inter angustias.*
10 Coartatus undique locum euadendi inuenire non potuit, fugiens Chaldeos, incidit in Egyptios et cum ab Egyptiis fugeret, occurrit Assyriis.

Mystice ‘Iudas’, qui interpretatur ‘confitens’, designat quosdam in Ecclesia qui nomen Christi confitentur, sed quia in amore Christi adhuc firmi non sunt, pati pro Christo aduersa erubescunt. De qualibus dictum est: ‘Ad tempus
15 credunt et in tempore temptationis recedunt.’ Isti ergo propter afflictionem et multitudinem seruitutis migrant, quia dum passionibus iustorum communicare nolunt, a consortio iustorum alieni fiunt.

14/15. Luc. 8:13

12/14. Iudas...erubescunt: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1069D

2/3. in nocte diem expectant et in die noctem desiderant] in die noctem expectant et in nocte diem desiderant *Br1 Eb P4 P6 Pr*

3. et dum] quia dum Φ^{2-3}

6. affectum] afflictum *G W*

7. in diuersa uota mentem] in diuersa mentem uota *V* in diuersam mentem uota *pat.*

9. apprehenderunt] apud *H W*

14. qualibus] quibus *Ba Br1 Eb Pr Wa*

16. migrant] *om.* Φ^2 *pat.*, grant in marg. *P2*

quia] in qua *pat.*

17. iustorum] sanctorum *Br1 Eb Wa*

262C *Habitaui inter gentes.* Habitare inter gentes est uitam et
conuersationem prauorum imitari. Requiem non inuenire est mundi huius
actionibus implicari. Quia enim in huius mundi actionibus finis non est, sectantibus
eas requies esse non potest. Sepe tamen homo pro amore presentis uite libenter
5 labores tolerat, quos pro amore Dei ferre recusabat. Fit ergo magna exprobratio
recedentibus a Deo simulque excusatio tollitur eis, quoniam aperte monstratur
quod sine causa preuaricati sunt, dum utiles labores declinando ad labores inutiles
descenderunt.

Omnes persecutores eius apprehenderunt eam inter angustias. Quandiu
10 cor hominis caritate et spe eternorum bonorum dilatatum est, si forte foris
tribulationem sustinet, intus tamen angustiam non habet. 262D Quantum ergo
bonum perdat, qui fiduciam que est in Deum perdit, hinc agnoscere potest homo,
quod semper angustiam in aduersis cor patitur, nisi per spem futurorum bonorum
dilatetur. ‘Inter angustias’, inquit, ‘comprehenderunt eam.’ Et attende que sint
15 angustie eorum qui a Deo recedunt: nunquam securi sunt, semper trepidant, in
prosperitate timent, in aduersitate desperant.

6. eis] ab eis Θ

9. apprehenderunt] spreuerunt *Br1 Eb*

11. sustinet] sustineat Φ

13. futurorum] eternorum *Ba R1*

14/15. sint angustie Σ¹. *p.c. E pat.*] sunt angustie Σ², sit angustia *cett.*

Migrauit Iudas. Sunt nonnulli qui dum peccata sua aspiciunt, transitoria quadam compunctione accensi usque ad confessionem perueniunt, melioris uite uias aggredi proponunt, ac se deinceps ad perpetrata uitia non redituros esse promittunt. **263A** Sed quia pro commissis condigna satisfactione semetipsos
5 affligere, et cum Apostolo corpus castigare, et in seruitutem redigere nolunt, cito superueniente temptatione ad ea que dereliquerant peccata reuertuntur, quia non facile uitii resistere possunt qui uitiorum affectus in semetipsis mortificare negligunt. De quibus hic dicitur: ‘Migrauit Iudas propter afflictionem et multitudinem seruitutis.’ Quid enim Iudas nisi peccata sua confitentes significat,
10 qui migrant propter afflictionem et multitudinem seruitutis, quando uicti post concupiscentias suas abeunt, quia eas per afflictionem et seruitutem carnis sue mortificare pertimescunt? Contra quos Sapientia dicit: ‘Fili, accedens ad seruitutem Dei, sta in timore et prepara cor tuum ad temptationes.’ **263B** Nam qui peccata sua confitentur et uitam suam emendare instituunt, isti nimirum ad
15 seruitutem Dei accedunt, sed ibi stare negligunt, quando aduersitatibus uicti a bono proposito cadunt. Hoc est quod monuit ‘prepara cor tuum ad temptationes’, ut in uia Dei ambulantes ad toleranda aduersa parati simus, qui, priusquam in uia Dei essemus, illicita nos perpetrasse meminimus.

5. cum Apostolo...castigare: cf. 1 Cor. 9:27

12/13. Fili...temptationes: Eccli. 2:1 (in timore] in iustitia et timore, cor tuum] animam tuam)

4. condigna] cum digna *L1 P2 P3*

5. corpus] *om. T2 T3*

9. significat] figurat Φ^2

11. quia] qui Δ^1

13. in timore] in iustitia et timore Φ^2 (*corr. D1*)

cor tuum] animam tuam $\Phi^2 M$

temptationes] temptationem $\Phi^2 Ba C$

14. instituunt] constituunt Φ^2

17. aduersa] uniuersa Σ^2 , ad uniuersa *O2*

qui] quia *Ca O4 P4 R1*

18. nos] non *pat.*

meminimus] intumuimus *pat.*

Habitaui inter gentes nec inueni requiem. Quid est inter gentes habitare, nisi desideriis carnalibus morem gerere? Vbi requies non inuenitur, illa nimirum quam Dominus in Euangelio laborantibus promittit dicens: ‘Inuenietis requiem animabus uestris.’ De qua peccatori dicitur: ‘Peccasti, quiesce.’ **263C** Et merito
5 qui in corpore laborem sustinere noluerunt, ad laborem anime perueniunt eorumque mentem furor malorum desideriorum exagitat, quorum carnem debita pena non castigat. Sic nimirum Samson ille erutis oculis ad molam ponitur, quia animus amisso lumine ueritatis per appetitum terrenorum desideriorum circumfertur. Qui uidelicet Samson quandiu capillum capitis habuit, insuperabilis
10 fuit, sed postquam in sinu mulieris obdormiuit et abrasus caput capillum perdidit, continuo ab hostibus capitur et cecatur, seruituti etiam addicitur. ‘Samson’ interpretatur ‘sol eorum’ et significat animum diuina cognitione illuminatum. Caput Samsonis principale est mentis. Capillus capitis radius est contemplationis. Sinus mulieris blandimentum est carnis. **263D** Quandiu ergo animus
15 contemplationi inheret, a temptatione superari non potest. Quod si in carnis delectatione resolutus fuerit, ibique obdormierit, continuo ueritatis intime lumen

3/4. Inuenietis...uestris: Matth. 11:29

4. Peccasti: Eccli. 21:1 (Fili, peccasti, non adicias iterum...)

4. Peccasti, quiesce] Peccasti ne adicias iterum, sed quiesce *pat.*

6. eorumque] eorum Φ^{1-2} *Br1 Ba P4*, et eorum *B C Eb M P4*

8. terrenorum] *om. T2 T3*

9. capillum] capillos Φ^2

habuit] habuerit *L1 P2 P3*

11. cecatur, seruituti etiam] cecatur et seruituti Σ^2 *Di Mu O1 P2 P3 Wa*

12. significat] figurat Φ^1

14. ergo] enim *pat.*

amittit et interciso radio contemplationis prauis motibus repugnare non sufficit,
tandemque erutis oculis ad molam ponitur, quando interne dulcedinis oblitus per
terrena desideria dissipatur. Quid enim est mola nisi mens instabilis et inquieta,
que dum semper nititur comprehendere quod appetit, quasi desideriis suis
5 circumagitata nunquam requiescit? Bene ergo dicitur: 'Habitauit inter gentes nec
inuenit requiem.' Quia mens que desideria carnis sequitur, tantum ab interna
quiete aliena est, quantum foris per labentia dissipatur.

264A *Omnes persecutores eius apprehenderunt eam inter angustias.*
Peiores sunt hi nonnunquam qui a proposito uirtutum corruunt, quam hi qui ad
10 uirtutis propositum nondum peruenire potuerunt, quia isti ad id quod nondum
habuerunt se sperant posse pertingere. Illi uero tanto longius a salute sunt, quanto
cum desperatione inchoatam uirtutem perdiderunt. Magis ergo hi insidiis
demonum patent, quam illi, quia illos spes future correctionis quodammodo
retrahit, istos uero desperatio sua ad ruinam impellit. Propterea de illis qui post
15 inchoationem boni ad uomitum redeunt hic dicitur: 'Omnes persecutores eius
apprehenderunt eam inter angustias.' Qui enim sunt persecutores nostri nisi
maligni spiritus et desideria carnis, que militant contra nos in membris nostris, et

1. motibus] moribus $\Phi^2 \Phi^4 B G H Mu N W$

4. comprehendere] apprehendere $\Omega Eb O2 R1 Wa$

5. requiescit] quiescit *Br1 D1 Eb P4 Wa*

10. uirtutis propositum] propositum uirtutis *Di G P6*

11/12. quanto cum desperatione] quanto euidentius cum desperatione *pat.*

13. correctionis] resurrectionis *Br1 Eb Wa*, correptionis $\Omega L1 L2 N P2 P5 R1$

16. Qui] Quid *H W*

17. contra] aduersus *Br1 Eb Wa*

que est angustia nisi desperatio peccatricis conscientie, que intus cor stringit?
264B Ille ergo ab omnibus persecutoribus inter angustias comprehenditur, qui
propterea demonibus suggerentibus peccatum et propriis desideriis non contradicit
in culpa, quia ex lapsu precedenti iam desperat de uenia. Migrat ergo Iudas
5 propter afflictionem, quando hic qui per confessionem iam uitam suam emendare
ceperat, fractus molestia temptationum a proposito cadit. Habitat inter gentes
quando mentem in delectatione carnalium desideriorum figit. Non inuenit requiem
quando cor eius concupiscentia per abrupta uitiorum distrahit. Ab omnibus
persecutoribus inter angustias comprehenditur quando iam desperatione pressus
10 nullis suggestionibus prauis reluctatur.

1. cor stringit] constringit Θ a.c. *Ol*

4. ex lapsu] elapsu Σ^2 , expulsu Δ^1 a.c. *E*

Iudas] *om. H* a.c. *E*

propter afflictionem] populus afflictionis *G Vi*

7. delectatione] delectationem *pat.*

2 **264C** Medicus noster egrotum in manibus tenens, ecce quomodo artis sue
peritiam probat. Primum stupida membra diu palpando ad sensum reuocat, et
tactu leni uulnera dolentia attrectando ad ictum confirmat. Deinde secat, deinde
ungit, deinde ligat, deinde fouet et ad plenam sanitatem reparat. Sic alphabetum
5 istud in quinque partitiones distinguimus. Prima est conquestio. Secunda est
increpatio. Tertia est consolatio. Quarta est preceptio. Quinta est deprecatio. Per
conquestionem palpat, per increpationem secat, per consolationem ungit, per
preceptionem ligat, per deprecationem fouet. Conquestio est a principio alphabeti
usque ad eum locum ubi dicitur: ‘Cui comparabo te’ etc. **264D** Ibi increpatio
10 incipit et tenditur usque ad eum locum ubi dicitur: ‘Fecit Dominus que cogitauit’

9. Cui comparabo te: Lam. 2:13

10. Fecit...cogitauit etc. Lam. 2:17

1. *Ante Medicus spatium uacuum relinquunt V Va1, add.* Finit de primo threno. Incipit de secundo quem totum ex integro exponit *C*, *addunt* Hic incipit de secundo alphabeto Φ^1 *P2*, Vie Syon lugent, eo quod non sit qui ueniat... Interrogate uias sempiternas... sed unusquisque recipiat prout gessit (Paschasius Radbertus, *excerpta PL* 120, 1071B/1104B) Finit Paschasii. Item ex tractatu Magistri Hugonis super Lamentationes Ieremie Prophete Θ , Explicit prima pars secundum Paschasium. Incipit secundum alphabetum secundum tractatum Magistri Hugonis canonici beati Victoris, uiri Christianissimi *T3*, Totius alphabeti primi epilogus *add. pat.*

egrotum in manibus] in manibus egrotum Θ *O3*

3. confirmat] conformat *B Eb L2 O2 P4 P6 a.c. E*

5. istud] *om. Δ^1 a.c. E*

distinguimus] distinguitur *Ba pat.*

est conquestio] conquestio est Φ

secunda est] *est om. $\Theta C H W$ a.c. E*

6. tertia est] *est om. $\Theta P6$*

Quinta est deprecatio] *est om. C*

7. palpat...consolationem] *om. Δ^1 a.c. E*

etc. Ibi consolatio incipit et tenditur usque ad eum locum ubi dicitur: ‘Deduc quasi torrentem lacrimas’, in qua preceptione peccatores informantur ad penitentiam, et tenditur usque ad eum locum ubi dicitur: ‘Vide, Domine.’ Abinde usque ad finem deprecatio est, in qua Propheta Dominum pro peccatoribus exorat.

5 His breuiter prelibatis, nunc ipsius conquestionis ordinem inspiciamus. Primum quasi absentes plangit, quia eos qui in amaritudine erant, tam cito presenti allocutione sollicitare non debuit. **265A** Incipit quoque ea in primis que minima sunt plangere, ne animos merentium improuisi doloris pondus opprimat, sicque paulatim a minoribus ad maiora enumerando progrediens sensim ad luctum excitat
10 animos auditorum. Primum ergo luget depopulationem regionis, deinde destructionem edificiorum communium, deinde euersionem sacrarum edium, deinde contaminationem sanctorum, deinde a rebus inanimatis progreditur ad miseriam hominum, deiectionem scilicet et inopiam deplorandam et sic tandem finit conquestionem suam.

1/2. Deduc...lacrimas: Lam. 2:18

3. Vide Domine: Lam. 2:20

1/2. Deduc...torrentem] *addunt* Ibi preceptio incipit *B Di M O2*, ibi preceptio *in marg. E*, Preceptio est *Re T1 T2 T3*,

in qua preceptione] in quo preceptio est qua *C*, in qua preceptio est *Le*,

3. Abinde usque] Et illinc usque *pat.*

ad finem] in finem $\Theta \Sigma^2 \Phi Ca$

7. debuit] deberet Φ

13. miseriam] miseram Δ^1

2:1 *Quomodo obtexit caligine in furore suo Dominus filiam Syon.*

Lamentabile principium ab admiratione inchoat, quia tam subito deiectus est populus ille, qui prius usque ad celum exaltatus uidebatur. ‘Caligo’ tristitiam tribulationis designat. **265B** ‘Filiam’, inquit, ‘Syon’. ‘Ipsam Syon’, id est gentem Iudeorum, quam paterno affectu dilexit et custodiuit. Vel ipsius Syon filiam, id est regionem Iudeam. Mos enim Scripturarum habet, ut metropolitane ciuitates ‘matres’ appellentur, et circumiacentes regiones, oppida quoque et castella et uici ‘filie’. Incipit ergo sicut supradictum est e longinquo plangere ipsam, scilicet regionem, ut tandem ad ipsum caput regionis Ierusalem perueniat.

10 Sequitur: *Et non est recordatus scabelli pedum suorum*: id est populi qui seruituti eius humiliter subiectus erat.

2:2 *Precipitauit Dominus nec pepercit.* Hic distingue. Sequitur: *Omnia speciosa Iacob destruxit in furore suo.* Hic iterum distingue. **265C** Deinde sequitur: *Munitiones uirginis Iuda deiecit in terram.* Hic rursum distingue.

2. Lamentabile...inchoat: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1106B

2/3. quia...uidebatur: cf. *ibid.*, 1106D

1. Syon] *om.* $\Delta^1 \Sigma Le O4 P6 Va2$

2. inchoat] inchoat Dominus *T1 T2 T3*

quia] quod *pat.*

8. e longinquo] de longinquo Φ , alonginquo *H*

10. Sequitur] *om.* Φ^2

14 rursum] rursus $\Delta^1 Cal O4 Va2$, iterum *Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

Deinde sequitur: *Polluit regnum et principes eius*. Quod in precedenti clausula generaliter sub nomine terre premiserat, hoc hic per partes exsequitur: speciosa, munitiones, regnum, principes. Et uide quomodo lamentum crescit. Prius solummodo terram nominauerat, sed forte^{ne} ipsa terra sterilis et inculta atque ideo
5 minus plangenda putaretur, subsequenter de eius quoque opulentia et sublimitate lamentum conformat.

‘Precipitauit’, inquit. Plus est precipitare quam proicere. Et quod est adhuc grauius *nec pepercit*. Hoc ueraciter in ultima captiuitate completum est, quando iam amplius reuocandi non sunt. **265D** ‘Precipitauit.’ Quid? Omnia
10 speciosa Iacob destruxit, munitiones uirginis Iuda deiecit. Per speciosa intellige opulentiam, per munitiones fortitudinem atque potentiam. Per Iacob et uirginem Iuda idem populus signatur. Iacob tamen generale nomen est duodecim tribuum, Iuda uero ad duas tribus tantum pertinet. Ideo generali nomine premissa, statim speciale nomen adiunxit, ut duarum se tribuum captiuitatem plangere
15 demonstraret. Iacob ergo et Iuda idem populus est, Iacob quia in potentia

Deinde sequitur] *om. Br I Eb Θ*

4. solummodo] solum, inde *pat.*

5. de eius quoque] quoque de eius *Br I Eb Le Mu Wa*

quoque] *om. Ω*

6. conformat] format *C Re*, confirmat *Eb pat. a.c. M*

8. adhuc] *om. Ba Br Eb P4 Wa*

9. quando] quia *pat.*

12. signatur] designatur *Θ*

14. se tribuum captiuitatem plangere] tribuum se captiuitatem plangere *Le OI P7*, tribuum captiuitatem se plangere *M*, tribuum captiuitatem plangere se *Di*

15. demonstraret] monstraret *Φ¹⁻⁴ N*

ergo] uero *Δ¹*

robustus, uirgo Iuda quia in opulentia delicatus. Quid est ergo speciosa Iacob, nisi opulentia fortium et quid est munitiones uirginis Iuda, nisi fortitudo opulentorum?

5 **266A** Sequitur: *Polluit regnum et principes eius*: hoc est uirginis Iuda. ‘Polluit’, dicit, propter gentes inter quas dispersi sunt. Ex quarum consortio et ritu profanati sunt, qui prius in Dei protectione securi regnabant et in principium suorum fortitudine confidebant. Nunc autem regnum totum cum principibus suis polluitur, quia populus cum protectoribus suis gentibus subiugatur.

10 **2:3** *Confregit in ira furoris omne cornu Israel. Auertit retrorsum dexteram suam.* Per cornu fortitudo principum eius signatur. Per dexteram uero Dei protectio diuina intelligitur. Quid est ergo quod de Deo dicitur, ‘Confregit omne cornu Israel. Auertit retrorsum dexteram’, nisi quia in populo preuaricatore et omnem humanam fortitudinem comminuit, et suam tandem protectionem abstulit, ut omnino desolati ostendantur, quibus post humana presidia etiam diuinum adiutorium tollitur? **266B** ‘Auertit’, inquit, ‘dexteram suam.’ Dexteram auertit ne
15 protegeret et sinistram extendit ut feriret.

1. opulentia] opulentiam $\Phi^2 \Phi^4 \Sigma^1 G N O1 P1 P2 P3 P6 T1 T2 W$ *pat.*

est] *om.* Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*

2. fortitudo opulentorum] fortitudinem opulentorum $\Phi^{1-2} \Phi^4 Mu N O1 O4 P1 R1 T2 V$ *pat.*, fortitudines opulentorum *T1*, opulentorum fortitudinem *G H P2 P3 W*

6. regnum totum] totum regnum Φ

7. subiugatur] subigatur Δ^1 uel subiugatur *add. in marg.* *E*.

8. furoris] furoris sui *pat.*

9. signatur] designatur Θ

11. Auertit] et simul auertit *pat.*

quia] quod *pat.*

Vnde sequitur: *Et succendit in Iacob quasi ignem flamme deuorantis in gyro*. Sicut enim ignis accensus late uagatur et consumit omnia, sic hostes Iudeorum, postquam in eis omnis fortitudo defecerat et diuinum auxilium subtractum erat, nullo sibi obsistente uniuersa uastabant.

5 **2:4** *Tetendit arcum suum quasi inimicus*. In arcu comminatio intelligitur. Arcum ergo tendere est comminationem amplificare uel differre. Qui autem post comminationem percutit, quasi inimicus arcum tetendit.

10 **266C** Vnde sequitur: *Firmauit dexteram suam quasi hostis*. Quando in Scriptura dextera Dei ponitur, aliquando protectio, aliquando grauis percussio designatur, eo quod dextera naturali habilitate ad percutiendum sit promptior. Prius ergo Deus dexteram auertit ne protegeret, postea dexteram firmauit ut feriret. Quod autem dicitur ‘firmauit dexteram’, grauem indignationem percutientis exprimit, uel super percussos dexteram firmat, quia plagam quam semel iratus intulit, sanare amplius non disponit, quod proprie ad ultimam

3/4. diuinum auxilium subtractum erat] diuinum subtractum erat auxilium Φ^{1-3} *M N*, auxilium diuinum subtractum erat *Ba*, diuinum auxilium erat subtractum *Wa*

4. obsistente] obsidente *pat*.

5. comminatio] communicatio *H a.c. E W*

11. dexteram auertit] sinistram auertit Θ

14. intulit] intulerit *P1 R1*, intulerat *M*

captiuitatem refertur. Vnde conuenienter adiungitur ‘quasi hostis’ qui scilicet ad
 internecionem percutit, non ad correctionem. **266D** Non enim quasi hostis
 dexteram firmaret, si illo ad perdendum percutiente, ipse ad corrigendum
 percuteret. Vnde cum graui dolore pronuntiandum est ‘quasi inimicus, quasi
 5 hostis’, ille scilicet cuius nec iram reus effugere nec misericordiam hostis potest
 impedire.

Sequitur: *Et occidit omne quod pulcrum erat uisu in tabernaculis filie
 Syon*. Non occiditur nisi quod uiuit. Superius dixerat, ‘Destruxit omnia speciosa’,
 sed hic iam aliquid amplius dicere uolens, *occidit*, inquit, omnia pulcra, ut hanc
 10 calamitatem non tantum diuitias, sed ipsas etiam animas abstulisse ostendat. Vnde
 recte subinfertur cum dicitur: ‘Effudit quasi ignem indignationem suam.’ Non
 quasi aquam, sed quasi ignem. **267A** Violentia enim aquarum deicere et dissipare
 res solet, non consumere.

2. internecionem *Br1 C Eb P4 P6 Re Wa*] internitionem $\Theta \Phi^{1-2} \Omega B Cal Le M N O2$, internectionem *E P2 P3*, interniciem $\Sigma^1 G H Va2 W pat. p.c. O4.$, interemptionem *P5*

correctionem] correptionem *Ba C D2 D3 P1 P4 P5 P6*, ad correctionem percutit] percutit ad
 correctionem Σ^2

5. scilicet] *om. $\Sigma pat. del. E$*

9. aliquid] *om. $\Phi^2 O1$*

9/10. hanc calamitatem] *per hanc calamitatem pat.*

10. ipsas] *om. Cal Va2*

Quarum inundationem per alium Prophetam Dominus comminatur dicens:

Ignis uero non tantum destruit, sed consumit. Atque ideo recte indignatio Dei quasi ignis effundi dicitur, quando diuina ultio usque ad consumptionem euagatur.

5 Postremo etiam in ipso effusionis nomine uiolentia et, ut ita dicam, abundantia tribulationis exprimitur.

2:5 *Factus est Dominus uelut inimicus. Precipitauit menia eius.* Hucusque desolationem filie Syon, id est regionis Iudee planxisse uidetur. **267B** Nunc ad ipsam matrem Syon, scilicet ciuitatem Ierusalem, deplorandam se conuertit dicens:

10 ‘Factus est Dominus uelut inimicus.’ Grauis dolor: Dominus qui fouere, qui diligere consueuerat, factus est uelut inimicus, quia iam non ut pater ad correctionem percutit, sed ut hostis ad consumptionem.

1. Quarum inundationem per alium Prophetam Dominus comminatur dicens] *om. Br1 Eb O2 P4 P6 Pr Wa*

Quarum inundationem] Quarum indignationem *P2 P3*, Quam indignationem Θ *post* dicens *spatium uacuum relinquunt Cal D1 G N O4 V a.c. Le M]* *om. $\Delta^1 \Phi^2 \Omega P2 P3 P5$, addunt* Indignatio eius effusa est ut ignis (Nah. 1:6) *B D2 D3*, Indignatio eius effusa est ut aqua *C*, Ignis deuorabit speciosa deserti (Ioel 1:20) Θ *p.c. M*, Super eos effundam quasi aquam iram meam (Os. 5, 10) *Ba*, Effundam sicut aquam super uos indignationem meam *Va2*, Aqua inundabit et delebitur fedus uestrum cum morte et pactum uestrum cum inferno non stabit (Is. 28:18) *p.c. Le*, Adducam quas diluuii super terram ut interficiam omnem carnem in qua spiritus uite est (Gen. 6:17) *pat.*

7. Precipitauit...eius] Precipitauit Israel. Precipitauit omnia moenia eius *pat.*

9. ciuitatem] *om. Ω*

12. correctionem] correptionem $\Delta^2 \Phi^1 \Phi^{3-4} N P6$

Precipitauit menia eius, id est Syon, dissipauit munitiones eius. Menia in ciuitate ad decorem fiunt, munitiones ad tutamen. Quid est ergo, ‘precipitauit menia eius, dissipauit munitiones’, nisi sublimia deiecit et fortia confregit? Quod ergo superius de regione planxerat, hoc idem nunc etiam in Ierusalem factum esse
5 deplorat, ut ibi per speciosa Iacob pulcritudinem regionis, hic per menia Syon decorem ciuitatis, ibi per munitiones uirginis Iuda munitiones regionis, hic per munitiones Syon ipsius Ierusalem munitiones significari intelligas. **267C** Vnde satis conuenienter ibi speciosa tantum, hic menia posuit, quia alius regionis et alius ciuitatis decor est. Decor namque regionis magis consideratur in ubertate frugum
10 et fecunditate peccorum; decor ciuitatis in sublimitate edificiorum et ideo speciosa destrui et menia precipitari dicuntur, ut omnia uastata cognoscas et ea uidelicet, que intus ciuitatem decorabant specie et que foris regionem utilitate.

Et repleuit in filia Iuda humiliatum et humiliatam. Descripta desolatione regionis et ciuitatis, quasi ad utranque respondens infert: ‘Et repleuit in filia’, id
15 est in gente Iudea, quam quasi filiam paterno affectu dilexerat, ‘humiliatum et humiliatam’, hoc est utriusque sexus humiliatis illam repleuit, ut humiliatis, id est deiectis plena sit. **267D** Vel per humiliatum, ordinem prelatorum accipere possumus, per humiliatam, plebem subiectam. Contra quod superius in uastatione regionis dixerat, ‘Polluit regnum et principes eius’, ut idem per regnum quod per
20 humiliatam, idem per principes quod per humilatum intelligamus.

7. significari] figurari Φ^1 , signari Φ^3

8. hic] *om.* Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*

11. cognoscas] agnoscas *Re T1 T2*, agnoscant *T3*

14/16. Et repleuit...illam repleuit] *Et repleuit in filia Iuda humiliatum et humiliatam*: id est in gente Iudea quam quasi filiam paterno affectu dilexerat, hoc est utriusque sexus humiliatis illam repleuit Φ^4

15. affectu] effectu *pat.*

2:6 *Et dissipauit quasi hortum tentorium suum.* Nunc ad destructionem sacrarum edium deplorandam accedit. Et quantum ad litteram spectat, per tentorium et tabernaculum significat templum Domini, quod erat in Ierusalem, quod primum a Chaldeis, deinde a Romanis subuersum est. **268A** Ideo autem
5 templum tentorium siue tabernaculum uocat, quia uice illius antiquitus filii Israel primum in deserto ac postmodum in Sylo ad cultum Dei tentorio et tabernaculo fungebantur. Ceterum tentorium proprie dicitur, ubi cortine funibus ad palos terre affixos extenduntur. Tabernaculum autem quibusdam tabulatis construitur, sicut de tabernaculo federis scriptum est, quod Moyses in deserto extruxit, cui
10 extrinsecus uela oppansa sunt et cortine ex omni latere distente. Dicitur ergo de subuersione templi: ‘Dissipauit tentorium suum, demolitus est tabernaculum suum.’ Secundum litteram autem congrua sunt uerba, ut id quod expansum est dissipetur, id quod terre fixum est quadam quasi suffossione demoliatur. ‘Quasi hortum’, inquit, ‘dissipauit tentorium suum.’ **268B** Quod Isaias his uerbis ante
15 predixerat: ‘Derelinquetur filia Syon quasi umbraculum in uinea et sicut tugurium in cucumerario.’ Ac si diceret, ‘Sicut ab horto et a uinea, postquam collecti fuerint fructus, custodia hominum tollitur, sic a populo isto, quia a fructu boni operis sterilis est, custodia diuina auferetur, ut sit in dissipatione et direptione

5/7. antiquitus...fungebantur: cf. Ex. 25:15

8/10. Tabernaculum... distente: Ex. 40:18/19

15/16. Derelinquetur...in cucumerario: Is. 1: 8

4/10. Ideo...distente: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1116C

15/16. Is. 1: 8: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1063C

3. significat] figurat Φ^1

4. autem] *om.* Φ

7. tentorium proprie dicitur] tentorium dicitur proprie *pat.*, proprie dicitur tentorium *P2 P3*

9. extruxit] construxit Φ

10. distente] distincte *Br1 Eb Wa*

13. quadam quasi] quasi quadam *Ba Di G H L1 L2 P7*

suffossione] suffusione $\Sigma^2 E Mu$

18. direptione] directione *P2 P3 a.c. L1 P1*

inimicorum suorum.’ Vel per hortum, locum uoluptatis et luxurie intelligere possumus, unde per legem prohibitum est, ne lucus in atriis Domini plantaretur, quia idolorum cultores sub frondosis arboribus et in locis uirentibus sacrificare solebant, lasciuie et uoluptati seruientes. Dicat ergo: ‘Dissipauit quasi hortum
5 tentorium suum.’ 268C Ac si diceret: ‘Quia in locum sanctitatis impudicitia et uoluptas introiit, ideo dissipatio et desolatio uenit.’

Sequitur: *Obluioni tradidit Dominus in Syon festiuitatem et sabbatum*, id est non solum reppulit hec, sed post repulsam amplius non requirit. Quod proprie ad ultimam captiuitatem pertinet, quando iam manifestata gratia priores legis
10 obseruantie penitus euerse sunt et repudiate.

Sequitur: *Et in opprobrium et in indignationem furoris sui regem et sacerdotem subauditur tradidit*. Regi honor debetur, deuotio in sacerdote diligitur. Ac nunc pro honore opprobrium regi ac pro deuotione indignatio redditur sacerdoti, ut omnis Iudaici populi excellentia et religio destructa
15 ostendatur.

1/2. locum...possumus] cf. Pasch. *In Lam.* 1117A

2. est] *om.* Δ^1 Σ *Le pat.*

in atriis] in atriis domus Δ^2

quia] quia et *V pat.*

4. solebant] consueuerant *Ba Br1 Eb Wa*

Dicat] Dicit *pat.*

6. introiit] introiuit Φ^{1-4} *N*, introierunt *M*

8. hec] hoc *Br1 Eb*

sed] sed et *Br1 Eb*

9. priores] prioris *pat.*

2:7 268D Sequitur: *Reppulit Dominus altare suum*. Hic iam de contaminatione sanctorum agere incipit. *Reppulit Dominus altare suum*. Implacabilem se esse ostendit, quando illud etiam, unde placari consueuerat, abicit.

5 Sequitur: *Maledixit sanctificationi sue*, id est sacrificiis, quibus offerentes prius sanctificare solebat. Quod nunc plane impletum cernimus, quando iam legales hostie que suo tempore offerentes sanctificare poterant, si post impletionem gratie teneantur, amplius Deum ad iracundiam prouocant.

10 Sequitur: *Tradidit in manus inimici muros turrium eius*, id est sanctificationis. **269A** Vt enim ostenderet se amplius priora illa sacrificia non recipere, ipsum locum, in quo offerri consueuerant, funditus euerti permisit, quatenus ex hoc liquido cunctis patesceret, quod desolato priore loco ritus prior cessare deberet. Quod autem dicit ‘muros turrium’, quantum ad litteram sic intelligendum est ac si diceret ‘turres muratas eius’ intransitiue, hoc est non solum
15 muros ciuitatis extrinsecus, sed muros turrium intrinsecus.

Vnde sequitur: *Vocem dederunt in domo Domini sicut in die solempni*. Ipsi uidelicet inimici, nullo sibi obsistente, uniuersa occupabant, et se preualuisse gaudebant.

1. Sequitur] *om. Di P7*

3. se] *om. Δ¹ a.c. E*

6. prius sanctificare] sanctificare prius *V pat.*

solebat] solebant *pat.*

8. prouocant] prouocent *pat.*

10. sanctificationis] sanctificationis eius *Θ Mu*

12. quod] quo *P2 P3*

13. ad litteram] ad litteram spectat *Di p.c. Val*

14. muratas *Θ Φ Ω*] munitas *Δ Σ pat.*

eius] *om. Θ*

intransitiue] intransitorie *M*

15. muros] sed etiam muros *pat.*

2:8 *Cogitavit Dominus dissipare murum filie Syon.* Ne hec tanta mala inconsiderate Deus intulisse uideatur, ante factum cogitasse, id est deliberasse dicitur. **269B** Per murum filie Syon, robur et munimen Iudaici populi intelligere debemus.

5 Sequitur: *Tetendit funiculum suum*, ut merita mensuraret, et unicuique secundum opera sua redderet. Vel ‘tetendit funiculum’, id est penam qua peccatores ligaret, protraxit diu per patientiam expectans, sed tanto grauius tandem feriens. Propter quod sequitur: *Non auertit manum suam a perditione*, id est quia neminem inuenit liberum a culpa, neminem reliquit immunem a pena.

10 Sequitur: *Luxitque antemurale et murus pariter dissipatus est.* Ita ambigue positum est *pariter*, ut ad utrunque referri posse uideatur, uidelicet quod uel antemurale pariter cum muro dissipatum sit, uel quod murus pariter cum antemurali luxerit. **269C** Possumus autem non incongrue per antemurale custodiam hominum, per murum autem intelligere custodiam angelorum, que
15 utraque a populo Iudeorum iusto Dei iudicio ablata est, ut nec homines foris nec angeli intus ab instanti tribulatione populum a Deo derelictum defendere possent, secundum quam acceptionem conueniens est distinctio, quod antemurale luxisse et murum dissipatum esse deplorat, ut uidelicet illos, id est bonos prelatos etiam
20 subuersione populi sui per compassionem tribulatos, istos uero, id est angelos ab eorum custodia sublatos esse ostendat.

5/6. Tetendit...redderet: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1120B

14. per murum...angelorum: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1120C

1. murum] muros *Br1 Eb*

10. pariter] *om. pat.*

13. autem] autem aut Δ^1 *a.c. E*

16. possent] potuissent Δ^1 *a.c. E*

20. sublatos] remotos *M*

esse] *om.* $\Theta \Sigma \Phi^1 \Phi^3$ *Le M Pr O4 R1 W pat.*

2:9 *Defixe sunt in terra porte eius*, id est Syon. Ad monimentum perpetui doloris, post euersionem omnium, signa ruine permanent. **269D** Neque enim porte ad munimentum, sed in signum calamitatis permanent, que ut late pateant, in terra fixe sunt, et ne defensaculum prebeant, perditis et contritis uectibus seras non
5 habent.

Sequitur: *Reges eius et principes eius in gentibus*, subauditur, *perdidit et contriuit*; et respicit ad id quod dixerat. Porte et uectes, id est, reges et principes, qui munimen et fortitudo populi erant, deiecti et abiecti et contriti sunt. Sequitur causa tanti mali: quia, ‘non est lex Domini apud eos’, id est quia preuaricatores
10 legis sunt; et quia ‘prophete eius non inuenerunt uisionem a Domino’, id est quia illos prophetas audierunt, qui ex Spiritu Domini locuti non sunt.

7. Porte...principes: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1122B

1. monimentum] monimenta Δ^1 a.c. E, munimentum Di G Mu

3. munimentum] monimentum Br1 Cal Le Mu O1 P5 P7 R1 Va2 a.c DI

9. preuaricatores] preuaritores P1 V

2:1 270A *Quomodo obtexit* etc. Sub unius gentis specie totius humani generis casum deplorat. Primus homo tribus modis percussus est: ignorantia, concupiscentia, mortalitate. Mortalitas autem mors ipsa cum uniuersis defectibus et penis ipsam mortem precurrentibus intelligitur. Dicat ergo: ‘Quomodo obtexit
5 caligine in furore suo Dominus filiam Syon’, quia hominem, quem ad contemplandum lumen ueritatis creauerat, peccantem deserens in tenebris ignorantie reliquit. Syon namque interpretatur specula, ubi hostium incursus de longe prospicitur. Primo autem homini dictum est: ‘De ligno scientie boni et mali ne comedas. Quacunque enim die comederis ex eo, morte morieris.’ **270B** Homo
10 ergo quasi in quadam specula erigitur, quando imminentis mali periculum per circumspectionem cauere iubetur. Quid igitur per filiam Syon, nisi animam hominis nondum adhuc usu circumspectionis roboratam accipere debemus? Nam sicut dicimus ‘filia Babylonis’, id est filia confusionis, et ‘filia Ierusalem’, id est filia contemplationis, sic dicitur ‘filia Syon’, id est filia speculationis, quasi in
15 speculatione adhuc tenera et nouella et necdum in uirile robur solidata. Ac si diceret: ‘Vel hoc furorem iudicantis mitigasse potuit, quod ille qui deliquerat, necdum usu et experimento obediendi in precepto solidatus fuit.’

8/9. Gen. 2:1-7

14. filia contemplationis: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1125A

1/3. Quomodo obtexit etc.] Quomodo...inclytam Israel Φ^2

defectibus] defectionibus *Br1 Eb Wa*

4. et penis] et *om.* Δ *a.c E*

6. ueritatis Σ^2] eternitatis *cett.*

7. specula] speculatio Ω

9. Quacunque] Quocunque Δ^1 *pat.*

13. dicimus] dicitur *pat.*

17. usu] *om.* $\Delta^1 \Phi^1$

et] *om.* *Mu R1 a.c. P1*

270C *Quomodo obtexit*, inquit. Quod tegitur, absconditur quidem, non aufertur. Quia lumen rationis per peccatum in homine obscuratum est, non ablatum. *Quomodo obtexit*. Texit ne superiora, hoc est celestia uidere posset.

Sequitur: *Proiecit de celo in terram inclitam Israel*. *Israel* interpretatur
5 *uir uidens Deum*. Primus autem homo, antequam peccaret, *Israel* fuit, quia per
contemplationis interne presentiam Deum uidit. Per terram igitur *Israel* congrue
corpus hominis accipimus, quod Deus quidem per creationem de terra sumpsit,
sed per immortalitatem quodammodo ad celum transtulit, quod quia rursus
exigente peccato hominis in mortem dissolui iussit, quasi de celo, id est de
10 incorruptione ad corruptionem terram *Israel* proiecit. **270D** Recte autem Propheta
plangendo casum hominis, primum caliginem mentis ac deinde corruptionem
carnis commemorat, quia merito precedere debuit in pena que precessit in culpa,
ut sicut caro, nisi prius corrupta mente, in delectationem illicitam non uenisset, ita
quoque, nisi prius per ignorantiam cecata mente, caro ad corruptionem
15 descenderet. Quia et ipse Adam, prius dum ^{re}queretur se abscondit, ac deinde
inuentus sententiam mortis accepit.

1/2. Quomodo obtexit...ablatum] *om.* Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*

3. Texit ne] *texitne pat.*

4. Proiecit] Proiecit Dominus Θ

in] *om.* $\Sigma^1 \Phi^2$ *Le M a.c. E Ol pat.*

5. quia *om.* Φ^2 *Ba M N a.c. Dl*

6. igitur] *ergo E Mu pat.*

7. accipimus] *accepimus pat.*

Sequitur: *Et non est recordatus scabelli pedum suorum in die furoris sui.*

Per pedes Domini, precepta eius intelliguntur, per uestigia pedum, cognitio
preceptorum, per scabellum pedum intelliguntur hi qui per obedientiam preceptis
Dei subiecti sunt. Quasi ergo in scabello pedes Deus posuit, quando primo homini
5 ad obediendum uite preceptum iniunxit. 271A Sed huius scabelli in die furoris
quasi recordatus non est, qui cum magna districtione ab eo penam transgressionis
exigebat, cui prius mansuete obediendi preceptum dederat.

2:2 *Precipitavit Dominus nec pepercit.* Precipitatio ad magnam et ad subitam
ruinam pertinet. Videte quam magna ruina. De paradiso in hunc mundum, de hoc
10 mundo in infernum homo corruit. De immortalitate in mortem, de morte in
dampnationem. Vnde bene adiungitur, ‘nec pepercit.’ Quasi enim peccanti
pepercisset, si reatum eius per penam examinaret, sed ipsum per mortem carnis in
corruptionem ire non compelleret, uel si post mortem carnis saltem in
dampnationem animam etiam non precipitaret.

2/3. Per pedes...preceptorum: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1107D

2. eius] *om.* Φ Cal

per uestigia] *per om.* Δ¹ Σ¹ Φ¹ C Le M N O1 O4 P3 R1 Wa *pat. a.c.* Ba Ca E P2.

8. ad²] *om.* Φ² Ba D1 Eb G Le N Re T3 Wa

9. Videte] Vide Ω

10. homo corruit] *om.* Σ (homo *del.* V) *pat. (excepto L2)*

immortalitate] mortalitate Θ

14. etiam] *om.* Σ² Φ Di *del.* E

271B Sequitur: *Omnia speciosa Iacob destruxit in furore suo. Iacob*
interpretatur 'supplantator'. Et homo quodammodo non per pugnam, sed per
gratiam Diabolum supplantavit, quando illuc unde Diabolus ceciderat, ascendendi
potestatem accepit. Iste Iacob in prima conditione sua intus et extra speciosus
5 fuit, cuius conscientia per innocentiam et caro per castitatem floruit. Sed destructa
sunt speciosa Iacob, quia et castitatis decorem concupiscentia polluit, et
conscientiam reatus sui sceleris fedam pariter et tenebrosam fecit. Vel speciosa
Iacob habuit, quia eum intrinsecus aspectus invisibilium bonorum letificabat, et
foris rerum visibilium pulcritudo ad Creatoris sui gloriam excitavit. 271C Sed
10 destructa sunt speciosa Iacob, quia Deus in ultionem primi reatus a mente eius
invisibilium bonorum cognitionem abscondit et visibilium rerum aspectum ab illa
spirituali iucunditate in concupiscentiam carnis commutavit.

Vnde bene adiungitur: *Munitiones uirginis Iuda proiecit in terram*. Quid
enim per uirginem Iuda, nisi castam anime intentionem accipimus, que uidelicet
15 intentio, cum ubique ad arbitrium diuine uoluntatis dirigitur, quid aliud quam
Domino confitetur? Cuius intentionis munitiones fuerunt bona desideria anime et

14. castam...intentionem] cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1110A

4. potestatem] potentiam Φ

sua] sui *pat.*

10. primi] sui Φ^2

naturales appetitus corporis. Quandiu enim nec caro foris nec anima intus aliquid inordinatum appetiit, quasi munita et securo intentio hominis in omni actione fuit. Sed cum naturalia desideria in illecebrosos appetitus et terrenos affectus degenerauerunt, quasi munitiones uirginis Iuda in terram proiecte sunt, ut iam
5 nunc etiam in bonis intentio hominis securo non sit, cum facile e uicino per inordinata desideria corrumpi ac decipi possit.

Vnde subiungitur: *Polluit regnum et principes eius*. Regnum anime caro fuit, quandiu ipsa Deum in se per amorem regnantem habuit. Principes regni uirtutes anime fuerunt, per quas anima motus carnis et appetitus rexit. Postquam
10 autem spiritus contra Deum tumuit, statim contumeliam contradictionis in carne sua inuenit, quia Deo disponente actum est, ut munditia castitatis in pollutionem concupiscentie transiret, ut ubi prius humilis gloriabatur, ibi superbus erubesceret.
272A Regnum ergo eius, hoc est anime et principes eius, scilicet regni Deus polluit, quia ex concupiscentia, per quam carnis integritas uiolata est, etiam
15 uirtutes anime maculari sinit.

3. in] *om.* $\Phi^2 \Phi^4$, per *C p.c. P1*

illecebrosos] illecebrasas *Mu V a.c. Ma*, illecebrosus $\Phi^{1-2} \Phi^4 B R1 a.c. P1$

et terrenos affectus] et *om.* Φ^1 , per $\Phi^2 \Phi^4$, in *p.c. P1*

4. degenerauerunt] degenerauerint *R1*, degenerauerit Φ^4

5. nunc] nec Φ^2

etiam] *om.* $\Sigma pat. del. E$

bonis] bono Θ

8. Deum in se] in se Deum *pat.*

10/11. contumeliam contradictionis in carne sua $\Theta \Sigma$] contradictionis contumeliam in carne sua Ω ,
contumaciam contradictionis in carne sua *pat.*, contumeliam in carne sua contradictionis $\Delta \Phi$,

2:3 *Confregit in ira furoris omne cornu Israel* etc. Per cornu, fortitudo
uirtutis signatur, per Israel, homo, per dexteram, Dei protectio, per inimicum,
Diabolus, per faciem inimici, instantia Diaboli, per ignem, concupiscentia, per
gyrum, corpus quod circumdat animam. Cornu cum animali non nascitur, et tamen
5 inest ei naturaliter causa unde cornu oriatur. Sic anima non ex natura, sed ex
gratia uirtutes habet, quas tamen uirtutes eadem gratia non sine naturali consensu
liberi arbitrii in homine operatur. **272B** Sed quia homo libertatem arbitrii peccando
perdidit, et Deus homini peccanti iuste gratiam suam subtraxit, quasi omne cornu
Israel confractum est, quia etiam habitas uirtutes perdidit, et eas etiam quas
10 habiturus erat obtinere non meruit. Est etiam aliud quod in cornu notare
possumus. Cornu namque crescendo ex humore carnis indurescit, et rationalis
creatura cooperante gratia ex promotione uirtutum robur accipit. Item sicut cornu
caput et pedes munit, sic uirtus mentem intrinsecus et foris opera a lesione
custodit.

4/10. cornu non meruit: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1111B

1. furoris] furoris sui *pat.*

7. liberi] *om.* Φ^4

9. etiam] et iam *Le Ma Mu pat.*, et etiam *H W*, iam *OI*, et *Eb Pr*

10. meruit] potuit $\Phi^2 G$

13. uirtus mentem intrinsecus et foris opera] uirtus et mentem intrinsecus et foris opera $\Sigma^2 Val$, uirtus et
foris opera et mentem intrinsecus Θ , uirtus et foris opera et intrinsecus mentem *OI*, uirtus et foris mentem
intrinsecus opera *Di*

Auertit retrorsum etc. Primum hominem in uia obedientie ambulantiem
Diabolus sequebatur, ut eum reuocaret, sed accessum nocendi ad hominem habere
non potuit, quia dextera Dei inter illum et hominem fuit. **272C** Cum uero homo ad
suasionem Diaboli sponte se conuertit, statim Deus dexteram suam retrorsum a
5 facie inimici auertit, ut eum iam instantem a lesione hominis non repelleret,
quatenus transgressionis sue culpam preuaricator uel in pena sentiret.

Sequitur: *Et succendit in Iacob quasi ignem* etc. Ignis est concupiscentia
carnis, quam nascendo contrahimus, et quandiu in hac corruptione uiuimus, quasi
quendam domesticum hostem intra nosmetipsos portantes toleramus. Iste ignis
10 semper in nobis est, sed non semper ardet, non semper flammam habet. Tunc
autem ignis in flammam accenditur, quando peccati fomes usque ad delectationem
et consensum suscitatur. Que uidelicet flamma in gyro deuorat, quia sicut tineam
uestimentum consumit, ita quoque integritatem carnis, qua anima uestitur, praua
delectatio corrumpit. **272D** In gyro deuorat, quia per omnes sensus corporis ad
15 castitatem anime uiolandam circumquaque uirus corruptionis infundit. Vel per
gyrum, mundum istum accipere possumus. Concupiscentia autem carnis in gyro
deuorat, quia per omnia huius mundi oblectamenta discurrens, desideria sua mala
satiare laborat.

7/8. Ignis...carnis: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1111A

3. illum] eum *pat.*

8. corruptione] concupiscentia *pat.*

16. carnis] *om.* Φ

18. laborat] festinat *BrI Eb Wa*

2:4 *Tetendit arcum suum* etc. In arcu comminatio accipitur, in dextera firmata uehemens percussio notatur. Deus ergo et arcum tendit et dexteram firmat, quia peccanti homini et in futuro penas perpetuas comminatur et interim presentibus etiam flagellis reatum eius ulciscitur. Quod tamen quoniam non ex ira, sed ex
5 misericordia operatur, non inimicus et hostis, sed ‘quasi inimicus’ et ‘quasi hostis’ dicitur. Quod legi etiam aliter potest. **273A** Arcum Deus tendit, quando comminatur peccatoribus penam, et tamen adhuc expectando differt sententiam. Sed quia quosdam differt, ut correcti emendentur, quosdam uero ut perseuerantes in malis grauius puniantur, in his quos ad emendationem expectat, arcum tendit
10 non quasi inimicus, sed quasi propitius; in his uero quos ad cumulum dampnationis uiuere sinit, quasi inimicus arcum tendit. Similiter in his quos per flagella corrigit, firmat dexteram, sed non quasi hostis. Quos autem ad interneccionem percutit, in his dexteram firmat quasi hostis. Quod autem dicitur ‘firmauit dexteram’ sic intelligi potest. Primo namque homini quasi dexteram Deus
15 imposuit, quando peccanti plagam mortalitatis inflixit, quam dexteram adhuc confirmat, quotiens primo uulneri quotidiana flagella superadicit. **273B** Quod uero

8/10. Sed ...propitius: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 112D/1113A

5. non inimicus et hostis sed quasi inimicus et quasi hostis] non inimicus sed quasi hostis Σ^2 *Va1*, non inimicus et quasi hostis Σ^1 , non inimicus sed quasi inimicus et quasi hostis *pat.*

6. etiam aliter] etiam et aliter Θ

8. correcti] correpti Φ^{34} *P2 P3 P5 R1*

9. in malis Θ] *om. cett.*

13. interneccionem] *Br1 C Eb P4 Re Wa pat.*, internitionem $\Theta \Phi^1 \Omega B Ba Cal G H Le M Ma N O2 P1 V$ *Va1 Va2 W*, interneccionem *E P2 P3*, interemptionem *L2*

15. inflixit] infixit Δ^1 *Cal Va2 a.c. E*

15/16. quam...superadicit: *om. Cal Va2*

16. superadicit] superaddit Φ^1 , superadiecit *O2*, supra dixit *P3*, supra adicit *pat.*

supra¹ dixit] ‘Auertit dexteram suam’; et hic dicit, ‘Firmauit dexteram suam’
 contrarium non est. Auertit enim ne protegeret; conuertit ut percuteret; firmauit ut
 flagella multiplicaret, quatenus presens pena percussos doceat qualis eos, qui in
 malo perseuerauerint, pena in futuro expectat. Vnde dicitur in Psalmo: ‘Dedisti
 5 metuentibus te significationem, ut fugiant a facie arcus, ut liberentur dilecti tui.’

Sequitur: *Et occidit omne quod pulcrum erat uisu in tabernaculis filie
 Syon.* Tabernaculum anime corpus est, quia illud sensificando inhabitat.
 Tabernaculum etiam anime conscientia est, quia in illa quisque secum cum
 domesticis cogitationum suarum pausat. **273C** Omne igitur quod pulcrum erat
 10 uisu in tabernaculis filie Syon Dominus occidit, quia et foris omnem uigorem et
 pulcritudinem corporis humani ab illo immortalitatis statu arescere fecit, et
 intrinsecus conscientiam hominis rectarum cogitationum honestate spoliauit. Vel
 per omne quod pulcrum erat uisu accipere possumus foris disciplinam et decorem
 bonorum operum, et intus, ut dictum est, munditiam bonarum cogitationum. Et
 15 nota quia non occiditur nisi quod uiuit. Viuunt bona opera, quando recta
 intentione fiunt. Viuunt bone cogitationes, quando amoris intimi affectum
 sentiunt. Cauendum autem est cum Deus ab homine uirtutes perimere et auferre
 dicitur, quatenus hoc non agendo, sed permittendo facere credatur. **273D** Facit
 enim quia iusto iudicio fieri permittit.

4/5. Dedisti...dilecti tui: Ps. 59: 6

4/5. Ps. 59: 6: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1113B

18/19. sed permittendo...permittit: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1114A

3. multiplicaret] multiplicarentur Φ

5. ut liberentur] et liberentur *pat.*

13. uisu] *om.* $\Delta^1 \Sigma \Phi^1 \Omega$ *CaI Le M N pat.*

14. munditiam] *om.* Φ^2

15. quia] quod *Eb P4 Wa pat.*

18. fieri] facere Φ^{1-2} *Ba Eb M N*

Sequitur: *Et effudit quasi ignem indignationem suam.* In effusione
abundantia signatur. Ac si diceret: ‘Non stillauit, sed effudit quasi ignem.’ Non
quasi aquam, sed quasi ignem. Ignis etiam dura et fortia consumit. Quasi ignis
ergo indignatio effunditur, quia in uindictam preuaricationis peccatoris non solum
5 caro, sed anima quoque cruciatur. Vel quia ignis lutum indurat, dura uero aut
liquefacit aut incinerat, quasi ignis indignatio effunditur, ut in una eademque pena
duri et rebelles confundantur et pereant. qui uero suam infirmitatem humiliter
agnoscere uoluerint, confirmentur et salui fiant.

2:5 274A *Factus est Dominus uelut inimicus.* Nos fecimus quare inimicus sit,
10 qui prius inimicus non fuit, quia non id quod ipse creauit, sed quod nos fecimus
odit.

Sequitur: *Precipitauit menia eius, dissipauit munitiones eius.* Alia sunt
menia anime, alie sunt munitiones. Menia ad decorem, munitiones ad tutamen
pertinent. Sic sunt quedam dona gratiarum que ornant, ut est prophetia, genera
15 linguarum, interpretatio sermonum, quedam que muniunt, ut est fides, spes,
caritas. Illa si adsint, prebent uirtutibus ornamentum, ista si desint, periculum. Illa
etsi desint, salutem tamen non impediunt, sine istis homines ad salutem peruenire
non possunt. **274B** Bene autem prius dicitur, ‘Precipitauit menia’, ac deinde
subiungitur, ‘dissipauit munitiones’, quia cum peccatrix anima relinquitur, prius
20 auferentur ab ea dona que ad manifestationem data sunt, ac deinde fidei, spei et
caritatis fundamenta euertuntur.

Precipitauit, inquit, menia. Quod sublime est precipitatur, quod solidum
est dissipatur, quia, ut dictum est, menia ad gloriam, munitiones pertinent ad
tutelam.

13/18. Menia...non possunt: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1115B/C (prophetia...interpretatio sermonum: 1115C)

19/21. quia...fundamenta: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1115D

3. etiam] enim *Ba Br1 Mu P5 pat.*

5. sed anima quoque] sed etiam anima *Br1 Eb R1 Wa*, sed anima etiam *Mu*

7. uero] non Φ^2

12/13. Alia...munitiones] *om. Δ¹ a.c. E*

Sequitur: *Et repleuit in filia Iuda humiliatum et humiliatam*, id est spiritum et carnem in homine miseria et dolore replendo humiliavit, ut qui bene humiliari noluerunt per uirtutem, humiliarentur per afflictionem. Vel per humiliatum et humiliatam sensum et cogitationem accipere possumus, ut intus et
5 foris contumeliis agatur, donec confusa ad penitentiam redeat.

274C Ad populum etiam Iudaicum hoc specialiter referri potest. Considerans namque Propheta qualiter Deus post eiectionem primi hominis misereri uolens humano generi, solum hunc populum elegit, ut in eo nostre salutis exordia prepararet, quomodo illum date legis mandatis coluit et sua ubique
10 protectione sublimauit, et post hec omnia peccantem et preuaricantem abiecit, et ita prime abiectiōni secundam adnumerans plangit dicens: 'Factus est Dominus uelut inimicus. Precipitauit menia eius. Dissipauit munitiones eius.' Quando enim a populo Iudeorum prophetiam et doctrinam et miraculorum signa abstulit, quasi
15 menia eius precipitauit. Quando uero per infidelitatem eos excecari permisit, et a spe promissionis et hereditatis sue alienos fecit, quasi munitiones eius dissipauit.

274D Sequitur: *Et repleuit in filia Iuda humiliatum et humiliatam*. Quid per humiliatum, nisi ordinem prelatorum, et quid per humiliatam, nisi plebem subiectam accipimus? Vtrique enim in aduentu Christi humiliati sunt, quia ueritatem, quam uenturam predicauerunt et crediderant, presentem negauerunt.

3/5. Vel per humiliatum...redeat: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1115D/1116A (intus...redeat: 1116A)

13/14. prophetiam...precipitauit: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1115C

5. agatur] angatur Θ

6. Ad] ad Δ¹

10. post] postea Δ¹

11. abiectiōni] adiectioni P5 pat.

adnumerans] adnuntians Φ, annectens Ba, admirans Ca

15. promissionis] permissionis pat..

alienos] om. L1 L2

fecit] om. Σ pat., alienauit L1 L2

effecit Ca2

2:6 De quibus adhuc subditur: *Et dissipauit quasi hortum tentorium suum.*

Tentorium deforis est, tabernaculum intrinsecus, sicut et tabernaculum federis, in quod Moyses intrat ad consulendum Dominum. Recte ergo per tentorium, populus, per tabernaculum, ordo prelatorum signatur. Quando enim populum
5 illum antiquum Deus ita temporali gloria sublimauit, quasi tentorium ad decorem expandit. **275A** Cum uero quosdam ex illis ad cognitionem secretorum suorum illuminans, etiam familiari alloquio suo dignos habuit, quasi tabernaculum ad inhabitandum extruxit. Sed quia postmodum in carne ueniens, populum illum, exigentibus peccatis suis, et cognitione ueritatis priuauit, et deinde per Romanos
10 in omnes mundi nationes dispersit, recte nunc dicitur: ‘Dissipauit tentorium suum, demolitus est tabernaculum suum.’ Et notandum quod tentorium non demolitum sed dissipatum, et tabernaculum non dissipatum dicit, sed demolitum asserit. Quod enim demolitur sensim et latenter destruitur. Quid ergo per demolitionem nisi latens odium exprimitur? Tabernaculum ergo demolitum est et tentorium
15 dissipatum, quia nisi Scribas et Phariseos, doctores populi, in necem Saluatoris compulisset inuidia, populum ipsum tam crudeliter non dissipasset captiuitatis uindicta. **275B** Et uidete qua similitudine tentorium dissipatum dicat:

2. sicut et tabernaculum] et *om.* Θ

3. quod] quo Φ

Dominum] populum Φ²

4. signatur] designatur *Br1 Eb Wa*

7. habuit] habuerit *L1 P2 P3*

8. extruxit] destruxit *H a.c. E W*

9. suis] eius *pat.*

13. Quid ergo] Quid ergo in hoc loco *pat.*

16. populum ipsum tam crudeliter non dissipasset] nequaquam populum ipsum tam crudeliter dissipasset

B Br1 Eb P4 Wa

‘quasi hortum’, dicit. Sicut hortus dissipatur, quando collectis ex eo fructibus
sepis destruitur et custodia remouetur, sic ille populus, postquam fructum iusticie
ferre desiit, statim custodia et tutela Dei ab eo recessit, secundum uaticinium Isaie
dicentis: ‘Derelinquetur filia Syon sicut umbraculum in uinea et sicut tugurium in
5 cucumerario.’ Et ipse Dominus in Euangelio Iudeis loquitur dicens: ‘Auferetur a
uobis regnum Dei et dabitur genti facienti fructum eius.’ Hortus enim sterilis et
non faciens fructum, id est Synagoga Iudeorum dissipatur et hortus fructum
faciens id est, Ecclesia gentium munitur atque concluditur, sicut in Cantico
canticorum dicitur: ‘Hortus conclusus, soror mea, hortus conclusus, fons
10 signatus.’ **275C** Bene autem sororem uocat quam hortum conclusum nominat,
quia Ecclesia gentium per fidem de Synagoga nata est. De qua et Christus carnem
sumpsit, sed tamen eandem Synagogam, quia fructum iusticie non habebat, quasi
hortum sterilem dissipauit. Mater ergo Christi, hoc est Synagoga, hortus est
dissipatus. Soror Christi, id est, Ecclesia, hortus conclusus.

4/5. Derelinquitur... in cucumerario: Is. 1:8

5/6. Auferetur... fructum eius: Matth. 21:43

9/10. Hortus... signatus: Cant. 4:12

4/5. Is. 1:8: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1063C

7. Synagoga Iudeorum: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1116D

8/10. in Cantico... signatus: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1116D

1. dissipatur] *om.* $\Phi^3 M$

5. Iudeis] *om.* Φ

7. fructum] fructus $\Phi^4 C$

11. et] etiam *pat.*, *om.* *Ba H*

12. eandem Synagogam] eadem Synagoga Φ^{1-2}

13/14. est dissipatus] est *om.* $\Delta^1 a.c.$ *E*

14. Soror Christi] Soror autem Christi *Di*, Soror uero Christi *P7*, Soror ergo Christi *O1 Re*

hortus conclusus] hortus est conclusus $\Sigma^2 Br1 Wa p.c E$

Sequitur: *Obluioni tradidit Dominus in Syon festiuitatem et sabbatum.*
Legales enim obseruantie umbre quedam fuerunt futurorum, et ideo, postquam ipsa Veritas uenit, iam ultra Deus ad cultum suum priora non admittit. **275D**
Quasi enim oblitum dicit, quia amplius illa sibi exhiberi non precipit.

5 Sequitur: *In opprobrium et indignationem furoris sui regem et sacerdotem,* subauditur, *tradidit.* His duabus personis regebatur populus ille. regali scilicet et sacerdotali. Et conuenientia sunt uerba. Honor ad regem. deuotio pertinet ad sacerdotem. Nunc autem contra honorem, opprobrium, contra deuotionem, indignatio ponitur, et sacrificiis eorum Deus non placatur, sed
10 irascitur, sicut per Isaiam dicitur: ‘Sanguinem hircorum et uitulorum et arietum nolui, incensum abominatio est michi. Cum ueniretis ante conspectum meum, quis quesiiuit hec de manibus uestris?’ **276A** Et per Psalmistam: ‘Non accipiam’, inquit, ‘de domo tua uitulos, neque de gregibus tuis hircos. Immola Deo sacrificium laudis et redde altissimo uota tua.’

10/12. Sanguinem... uestris: Is. 1:11-13 (Holocausta arietum et adipem pinguium et sanguinem uitulorum et agnorum et hircorum nolui. Cum ueneritis ante conspectum meum, quis quesiiuit hec de manibus uestris ut ambuletis in atriis meis, ne adferatis ultra sacrificium frustra, incensum abominatio est mihi.)

12/14. Non accipiam...uota tua: Ps. 49: 9, 14

4. sibi] illis Δ^1 a.c. E

7. regali] legali Σ pat.

9. et] quia Ω

Deus] Dominus E H

11. abominatio est michi] abominatio michi est Δ^1 L1 L2 P2 P3

12. hec] hoc P2 P3 Re

13. inquit] om. C Di L1 L2 Le M Wa

Si autem ea que supradicta sunt ad moralem sensum conuertimus, per
tentorium non incongrue accipere possumus bonam actionem, que foris ad
decorem panditur. Per tabernaculum uero conscientiam, in qua quisque familiari
quadam et domestica conuersatione secum commoratur. Nam quod tabernaculum
5 conscientiam significat, Psalmista manifestat cum dicit, ‘Vox exultationis et salutis
in tabernaculis iustorum.’ Iusti namque quasi in tabernaculis suis uocem proferunt,
quia de bonis actibus suis intus in conscientia soli Deo innotescere uolunt. **276B**
Quasi ergo tentorium dissipatur, quando boni operis nitor a statu rectitudinis
uento adulationis conquassatus impellitur. Tabernaculum autem demolitur,
10 quando munditia conscientie illicita delectatione latenter corrumpitur.

Et recte dicitur: ‘Dissipauit quasi hortum tentorium suum.’ In hoc enim
quisque sterilis esse incipit, quod de bono opere suo in oculis hominum gloriari
querit, ut iam de reliquo ad bene operandum tutela Dei indignus sit, quia germinis
sui fructum, id est operis sui mercedem apud Deum non custodit. Hoc etiam in
15 tentorio notare possumus, quod sicut tentorium primum funibus extenditur,
deinde ipsi funes palis affixis terre retinentur, ita quoque bona operatio per
intentionis perseuerantiam tendi debet, ne relaxetur, et ipsa intentio, ne a
proposito suo lentescat, per spem eterne remunerationis, quasi palis quibusdam
soliditati terre affixis confirmari.

5. significat] significet *L1 M*, signet Φ^3

6. namque] autem Ω

suis] *om.* $\Phi^2 \Phi^4 C N R1$ *pat.*

10. latenter] *om.* $\Phi^{1-4} N$

13. quia] et $\Phi^1 Ba G M N R1 W$

16. bona] *om.* Φ , beata *M*

17. relaxetur] laxetur *M pat.*

276C Sequitur: *Obluioni tradidit Dominus in Syon festiuitatem et sabbatum*. Quid per festiuitatem, nisi gaudium internum, et quid per sabbatum, nisi quies mentis accipitur? Duo enim supradixerat, scilicet: ‘Dissipauit tentorium suum et demolitus est tabernaculum suum.’ Ad hec duo respondere uidetur. Ac si
5 diceret: ‘Quia dissipauit tentorium suum, ideo obluioni tradidit festiuitatem. Quia uero demolitus est tabernaculum suum, ideo obluioni tradidit sabbatum.’ Nam quanta sit interni gaudii dulcedo non meminit, quisquis in laudibus hominum et in rebus transitoriis gaudium querit, et nequaquam uera pace intus mens fruitur, cum per incentiua uitiorum et affectus carnalium desideriorum conturbatur.

10 276D Sequitur: *In opprobrium et in indignationem regem et sacerdotem*. Anima nostra et rex debet esse et sacerdos. Rex, quia regere debet carnem suam; sacerdos, quia Deo iugiter offerre debet deuotionem suam. Sed rex in opprobrium traditur, quando anima carni sue subiecta turpibus desideriis famulatur. Sacerdos in indignationem traditur, quando ab illa quam erga Deum habere consueuerat
15 deuotione obstinata mens ex peccati consuetudine obduratur. Deus ergo nos dissipat, nos demolitur, in obluionem, in opprobrium, in indignationem tradere dicitur, quia afflicta mens, hoc quasi a Deo fieri conqueritur, quod ab ipso iusto iudicio suo permittente non impeditur. 277A Permittit enim ut nos dissipemur, ut dissipati eius obliuiscamur, ut obliti eius in opprobrium et in indignationem
20 ueniamus.

2/3. per festiuitatem...mentis: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1117B

2. internum] eternum *Ba*, in eternum *P3*

6. obluioni tradidit sabbatum] tradidit obluioni sabbatum *Re T1 T2*

8. intus mens] mens intus Φ *Le*, intus *om. M*

10. sacerdotem] sacerdotem subauditur tradidit] Θ

12. Deo iugiter offerre] iugiter offerre Deo Φ^3 , Deo *om. M*

17. a Deo fieri] fieri a Deo *P2 P3*

iusto] *om. pat.*

2:7 Sequitur: *Reppulit Dominus altare suum*. Supra de excecatione Iudeorum locutus fuit; nunc quo ordine eadem facta sit subiungit dicens: ‘Reppulit Dominus altare suum.’ Quod est enim altare Dei, nisi Christus? Quia cum per ipsum Mediatorem humano generi Deus placatus redditur, quasi propitiationis nostre sacrificium super ipsum Deo offertur. Hoc altare Deus pater quasi reppulit, quando Christum usque ad crucis patibulum in manibus persequentium Iudeorum in passione dereliquit. **277B** Sanctificationi quoque sue Deus pater maledixit, quia ipsi quem singulariter sanctificauerat, et ad sanctificandos nos miserat, prius maledictionis nostre penam expiandam imposuit, ac deinde nos a reatu maledictionis absolutos sanctificationis illius participes fecit.

Sequitur: *Tradidit in manus inimici muros turrium eius*. Muri turrium, qui in ciuitate eminentiores sunt, Apostolos designant, qui tunc in sancta Ecclesia et dignitate eminentiores et constantia fortiores fuerunt. Sed isti quoque in manus inimici traditi sunt, quia cum Christum mori cernerent, quodammodo per infidelitatem corruerunt.

Sequitur: *Vocem dederunt in domo Domini, sicut in die solemni*. Domus Domini Ecclesia intelligitur. Vocem ergo exultationis inimici in domo Domini dederunt, quando ipso pastore mortuo et dispersis ouibus omnino se preualuisse gloriati sunt. **277C** Vel per domum Domini ipsum Christum accipere possumus, sicut dicit Apostolus: ‘Deus erat in Christo mundum reconcilians sibi.’ In domo itaque Domini uocem inimici dederunt, quando ipsi in cruce pendenti

20. Deus...sibi: 2 Cor. 5:19

3. Quod...Christus: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1118CD

7/10. Sanctificationi...fecit: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1119B

11/12. Muri...designant: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1119C

1. excecatione] execratione *M* *O*2, execatione *H*

3. est] *om.* Δ^1

8. ipsi] ipse *pat.*

insultabant dicentes: ‘Alios saluos fecit, seipsum non potest saluum facere. Si Filius Dei est, descendat nunc de cruce et credimus ei. Vnde bene adiungitur, sicut in die solemptni.’ Solempnitas enim generalis et communis est festiuitas. Quasi ergo in die solemptni uocem dant, qui impleto gaudio nichil iam desideriiis suis
5 superesse exultant.

Reppulit Dominus altare suum. Altare Dei in nobis fides nostra est, supra quam sacrificium boni operis immolamus. 277D Quod uidelicet altare tunc repellitur, quando fides nostra bonis operibus nudata a Deo reprobatur. De qua adhuc subditur: *Maledixit sanctificationi sue.* Sanctificatur quippe fides nostra,
10 quando ei per incrementa uirtutum merita augmentur. Sed sanctificatio maledicatur, quando amissis uirtutibus fides ipsa prauis etiam actionibus uiolatur.

Vnde adhuc subditur: *Tradidit in manus inimici muros turrium eius.* Quid enim muri turrium, nisi eminentiores uirtutes significant, que et solide sunt per fortitudinem, et erecte per circumspectionem? Muri ergo turrium in manus inimici
15 traduntur, quando subiecta sibi per consensum iniquitatis anima etiam summis uirtutibus aduersarius dominatur.

1/2. Alios...credimus ei: Matth. 27:42

1. seipsum] se Δ^1

4. impleto] impleti Δ^1 a.c. E

11. etiam] om. $\Theta \Sigma \Phi$ Le pat.

actionibus] actibus Δ^1 a.c. E, operibus N

12. subditur] additur Δ^1 (a.c. E) Ca1 Le Ma O4 V Va2 pat., dicitur Ol

278A De quo recte subinfertur: *Vocem dederunt in domo Domini*. Tunc enim in domo Domini inimici uocem dant, quando maligni spiritus intra conscientiam admissi non iam foris pulsantes renitenti peccatum suadent, sed intus presidentes consentienti imperant. Vnde pulcre per similitudinem subinfertur,
5 'sicut in die solempni.' Tunc quippe Diabolus plene exultat, quando nichil in nobis inuenit, quod eius uoluntati contradicat.

2:8 *Cogitauit Dominus* etc. Deus quasi homo ante factum cogitare dicitur, ne quid temere et absque deliberatione facere credatur. Deliberatio autem Dei nil
10 aliud est quam patientia et iustitia eius; patientia qua delinquentes, ut corrigantur, diu tolerat; iustitia qua perseuerantibus digna meritis recompensat. Vnde subiungitur: *Tetendit funiculum suum*. 278B Quid est enim super delinquentes funiculum tendere, nisi prius modum et quantitatem delicti diligenter examinare, ac deinde secundum mensuram culpe^{mensuram} moderari uindictae? Propter quod subditur:
15 *Et non auertit manum suam a perditione*. Ac si diceret: 'Neminem excepit a pena, quia neminem inuenit liberum a culpa.'

8. quasi homo: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1120B

8/9. ne quid...credatur: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1121D

12/14. Quid...uindictae: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1120B

8. Cogitauit Dominus etc.] Cogitauit...filie Syon Φ^2

14. Propter quod subditur] *om.* Φ

Quod legi etiam aliter potest, ‘Cogitavit Dominus’ etc. Per cogitationem quippe Dei occulta dispensatio incarnationis eius intelligi potest. Et quia in carne ueniens occulto quodam consilio Iudeos reppulit, ut gentes ad fidem colligeret, quasi prius murum filie Syon dissipauit, id est protectionem suam a populo Iudeorum abstulit, ac sic deinde funiculum hereditatis sue super populum gentium dilatauit. **278C** Quasi enim contractus erat funiculus eius, quando de populo Iudeorum tantum dicebatur ‘Iacob funiculus hereditatis eius’, sed tunc funiculus tenditur, quando, ut dictum est, sors hereditatis super omnes gentes dilatatur. Quia uero illuminationem gentium precessit excecatio Iudeorum recte subinfertur cum dicitur: ‘Et non auertit manum suam a perditione.’ Quasi enim funiculum tendens manum a perditione auerteret, si gentes colligens Iudeos non reprobaret. Hinc est quod Isaias Propheta, cum fidem gentium et futuram per spiritum cerneret excecationem Iudeorum, ait: ‘Multiplicasti gentem, non magnificasti letitiam.’ Multiplicata quippe gente letitia magnificata non est, quia priores Patres, quamuis quidem letarentur de futura salute gentium, simul tamen doluerunt de perditione Iudeorum.

7. Iacob...hereditatis eius: Deut. 32:9

13/14. Multiplicasti...letitiam: Is. 9:3

2/6. Et quia...dilatauit: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1118D-1119A

5. sic] *om.* Σ^2 *Le del.* *E*

gentium] Iudeorum *Ba P4 eras. N*, gentilem Φ^{1-2} *C*, gentilium *add. in marg. N*

8. hereditatis] hereditatis eius *C Eb L1 L2 P4 add. in marg. E*

9. excecatio] execratio *O2*

13. excecationem] execrationem *O2*

278D Vnde et hic quoque recte subiungitur: *Luxitque antemurale et
 murus pariter dissipatus est.* Quid namque in hoc loco antemurale, nisi priores
 Patres, et quid murus, nisi ipsum Mediatorem Dei et hominum designat. Sicut per
 5 Isaiam dicitur: ‘Vrbs fortitudinis nostre Syon, Saluator ponetur in ea murus et
 antemurale.’ Ipse enim secundum formam assumpte humanitatis, quasi murus
 nobis factus est, quia quos per fidem in se credentes recipit, contra
 impugnationem malignorum spirituum defendendo custodit. Sed quia sancti Patres
 etiam ad custodiendam Ecclesiam Dei iugiter predicatione et exemplo spiritualibus
 excubiis inuigilant, quasi antemurale in ciuitate Dei foris stant. 279A Dicatur ergo:
 10 ‘Luxit antemurale et murus pariter dissipatus est’, quia inde omnis priorum
 Patrum multitudo doluit quod perfidus Iudeorum populus Saluatorem ad se
 missum non recepit. Quod autem dicitur, ‘murus dissipatus est’, quantum ad eos
 dictum est a quibus est ablatus. Dissipatus est Iudeis ut edificaretur gentibus, quia
 per hoc fides eius ad gentes transiit, quod Iudea illam in perfidia manens
 15 reprobauit. Sicut per Psalmistam dicitur: ‘Lapidem quem reprobauerunt
 edificantes, hic factus est in caput anguli.’ Per hoc namque quod a perfidis Iudeis
 reprobatus est, gentium pariter et Iudeorum fidelium, quasi duorum parietum

4/5. Vrbs...antemurale: Is. 26:1

15/16. Lapidem...anguli: Ps. 117:22

1. Vnde et hic quoque recte] quoque *om.* Δ *a.c.* *E*, Vnde recte et hic quoque Φ

2. pariter] *om.* *P3 Val V pat.*

6. recipit] recepit *pat.*

10/11. omnis priorum patrum multitudo] omnis patrum priorum multitudo Δ , omnis multitudo priorum
 patrum Φ , priorum omnis patrum multitudo *P3*, patrum *om.* *M P2*

14. perfidia] perfida Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*

ex diuerso in unum concurrentium, caput factus est. **279B** Quod autem dixit
 ‘pariter’, sic accipi potest: uel quod murus pariter cum antemurali luxerit, uel
 quod murus pariter cum antemurali dissipatus sit. Neutrum enim a sana
 intelligentia discordat. Nam quod ipse etiam humani generis Redemptor cum
 5 ceteris fidelibus illius populi perfidiam et dissipationem fleuerit, Euangelium
 manifeste declarat, ubi dicitur: ‘Cum appropinquaret Dominus Ierusalem, uidens
 ciuitatem, fleuit super eam et ait: “Quia si cognouisses et tu quia uenient dies in
 te, et circumdabunt te, et coangustabant te undique, et ad terram prosternent te”.’
 Item quod societas sanctorum cum ipso suo capite ab eis dissipata sit, aperte in
 10 Actibus Apostolorum ostenditur, ubi narratur quomodo gens Iudaica, quando
 Christi fidem recipere noluit, etiam fideles illius a suis finibus eiecit.

6/8. Cum appropinquaret...prosternent te: Luc. 19:41-44: Et ut appropinquaret, uidens ciuitatem fleuit
 super illam dicens: ‘Quia si cognouisses et tu, et quidem in hac die tua quae ad pacem tibi, nunc autem
 abscondita sunt ab oculis tuis. Quia uenient dies in te, et circumdabunt te, et coangustabunt te, undique, ad
 terram prosternent te.’

7. Quia...et tu: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1121B

2. accipi potest] accipitur Δ^1 *a.c. E*

luxerit] dixerit *P2 P3 Val*

3. cum antemurali] *om. Ω*

7. eam] illam *Ba Re*

9. aperte] *om. $\Phi^{1-4} N$*

10. gens Iudaica] gens Iudeorum *G O2*

2:8 279C *Cogitavit Dominus* etc. Quid est quod Dominus ante factum cogitare dicitur, nisi quia Deus peccatores prius per patientiam diu tolerat, ut districtius postmodum per iustitiam culpam exquirat? Vnde recte nunc dicitur: ‘Cogitavit Dominus dissipare murum filie Syon.’ Quid namque per murum filie
5 Syon, nisi uirtutes anime accipimus? Et sepe omnipotens Deus eos, quos iam per fidem et gratiam spiritualium donorum in uisceribus Ecclesie sue in filios adoptauerat, propter praua opera postmodum reprobans ipsis etiam quas iam tribuerat uirtutibus priuat. Sed quia nobis peccantibus nunquam tam grauiter irasci solet, nisi nostris prius iniquitatibus diu prouocatus fuerit, recte nunc dicitur:
10 ‘Cogitavit Dominus dissipare murum filie Syon.’ **279D** Ac si diceretur: ‘Deliberat prius quam feriat nec cito profert sententiam, quousque subtili consideratione examinet culpam.’

Quod etiam euidentius explanatur cum dicitur: ‘Tetendit funiculum suum.’ Quid est enim funiculum tendere, nisi subtiliter mensuram peccati examinare? Vel
15 funiculum tendere est diu in peccato perseuerantes tolerare, non quod ipse faciendo iniquitatem augeat, sed quod iusto iudicio suo uel non corrigendo uel non puniendo in nobis prolongari permittat. Que iniquitas funiculus Dei dicitur, quia in nobis inuenit unde ligamur. **280A** Propter quod necesse est ut semper solliciti simus, ne nos per accepta dona uirtutum aut superbia eleuet aut
20 negligentia dissoluat, quia fortassis, dum nos male securi acceptam gratiam custodire

7. iam] *om. Di P3*

8. tam] *om. Br1 Eb Wa*

9. nostris prius iniquitatibus] prius *om. Φ P7*, prius nostris iniquitatibus $\Delta \Sigma^2$ nostris iniquitatibus prius]
Le

11/12. consideratione examinet] examinatione consideret *Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

14. enim] *om. Δ¹ a.c. E*

16. faciendo] patiundo *pat.*

18. ut *B Eb G Va2 Wa pat.*] quod *P7, om. cett.*

negligimus,quam horrendum sit quod de nobis inuisibilis iudex cogitet ignoramus. Qui quamuis peccantes nos dissimulans quidem, non ignorans diu patiatur, scire tamen debemus quod ubi longa deliberatio preceedit, grauis animaduersio sequitur, quemadmodum cernimus quod quanto quis attentius ictum uibrat, tanto
5 periculosius iaculatur. Vnde subiungitur: *Non auertit manum suam a perditione.* Ac si aperte diceretur: ‘Quanto magis prius patiendo sustinuit, tanto minus nunc feriendo parcit’; quia profecto iustum ualde est ut si nos manus nostras dum possumus ab illicito opere non retrahimus, Dei quoque manus in ulciscendo a perditione non auertatur.

10 **280B** Sequitur: *Luxitque antemurale et murus pariter dissipatus est.* Si per murum, ut dictum est, uirtutes anime significantur, recte per antemurale opera uirtutum accipimus. Quid est ergo quod Deo in nos uindicante antemurale luget et murus dissipatur, nisi quia eius gratia recedente et uirtus tollitur et opera uirtutis infatuantur? Tunc enim opera nostra bona lugent, quando amissa uirtute, etsi ad
15 tempus maneant, meritum tamen non habent. Sunt qui per murum opera, per antemurale fidem accipere uolunt. Et bene fides destructis operibus bonis lugere dicitur, quia absque bono opere apud Deum fides non approbatur.

15/17. Sunt...approbatur: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1121D/22A

1. quod] quid *pat.*

4. attentius] grauius *M*, grauius attentius *T1 T2 T3*

7. quia profecto] et profecto Φ^{1-4} *N*

9. auertatur] reuertatur Δ^1 *a.c. E*

11. ut dictum est] ut diximus Φ^2 *Di*

13. quia] quod *pat.*

 eius gratia] gratia eius Φ

15. maneant] manent *pat.*

 tamen] *om.* Δ^1 *a.c. E*

17. quia] et Φ^1

2:9 **280C** *Defixe sunt in terra porte eius, perdidit et contriuit uectes eius.* In portis sublimitas regni, in uectibus fortitudo notatur. Porte ergo in terra defixe sunt, sublimitas humiliata et deiecta. Vectes perdit et contriti fortitudo amissa atque comminuta. Quod qualiter factum sit, adiungit dicens: ‘Reges eius et principes eius in gentibus’, subauditur, ‘perdidit Dominus’, hoc est dispersit, et contriuit, id est in nichilum redegit. Quo merito etiam hoc euenerit subinfert: ‘Non est lex’, uidelicet, ‘apud eos’, quia legem Domini non custodiunt. *Et prophete eius non inuenerunt uisionem a Domino.* Cum amaritudine pronuntiandum est ‘prophete eius’. Ac si diceret: ‘Illos magis dilexit qui suo spiritu falsa prophetabant, quam illos qui a Domino uisionem inuenerunt.’

280D *Defixe sunt in terra porte eius* etc. Quid per portas et uectes ciuitatis, nisi prelatos populi accipere debemus? Idem namque et porte sunt per uerbum, et uectes sunt per consilium, et uie per exemplum. Per uerbum disertum, porte eree, per consilium firmum, uectes ferrei, per exemplum bonum, uie plane. Porte enim sunt quando extra positos per uerbum predicationis ad fidem introducunt. Vectes sunt quando intus per fidem constitutos, per consilium salutis confirmant et dirigunt. Vie sunt quando iam incipientibus recte incedendi, per bonam operationem exemplum fiunt. Recte ergo per portas Ierusalem, Scribas et Phariseos, doctores Iudeorum, intelligere possumus. De quibus hic dicitur:

18/19. per portas...Iudeorum: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1122B

2. Porte ergo] Porte ergo eius Θ , Porte eius ergo M

defixe] fixe Δ^1 a.c. E

5. in gentibus subauditur perdidit] subauditur in gentibus perdidit Φ^{1-3} Le N

13. disertum] desertum H $P2$ $P3$ $Va2$ a.c. E , discretum Φ^{1-4} N $P7$

15. ad fidem] om Φ^3 Di Pr

17. Vie Φ^1 $Ca1$ M $O4$ $Va2$ pat.] Via cett.

18. fiunt] om. H a.c. E , prebent W

Defixe sunt in terra porte eius. Porte si quidem erecte et solidos uectes habentes, pro tempore claudi et aperiri possunt, claudi uidelicet inimicis et aperiri amicis. **281A** Porte autem solute a uectibus suis et ablate, aditum quidem non muniunt, sed tamen intrare uolentibus non obsistunt. Porte uero que contritis uectibus in

5 terra defixe sunt, munimentum non prebent, sed intrare uolentes impediunt. Quid ergo sunt porte erecte, nisi doctores celestia predicantes, que bene in uectibus pendent, quia de consilio cordis firmatur uerbum predicationis? Et qui sunt porte destructe et ablate, nisi predicatorum negligentes et tepidi? Quos Dominus per Prophetam increpat dicens: ‘Canes muti non ualentes latrare.’ Et alibi: ‘Non

10 ascendistis ex aduerso in die Domini, ut poneretis uos murum pro domo Domini.’ De quibus etiam superius dixerat: ‘Porte eius destructe.’ **281B** Hic autem amplius aliquid insinuare uolens ait: ‘Defixe sunt in terra porte eius.’ Talibus namque in Euangelio Dominus dicit: ‘Ve uobis Scribe et Pharisei, quia tulistis clauem scientie. Ipsi non introistis et alios intrare uolentes prohibuistis.’

9. Canes...latrare: Is. 56:10

9/10. Non ascendistis...pro domo Domini: Ezech. 13:5 (Non ascendistis ex aduerso neque oppositis murum pro domo Israhel ut staretis in prelio in die Domini)

13/14. Ve uobis...prohibuistis: Luc. 11:52: (Vae uobis legis peritis, ...et eos qui introibant prohibuistis.)

13/14. clauem scientie: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1122C

2. aperiri amicis Θ Ω] amicis aperiri *cett.*

3. quidem] *om. pat.*

4. sed tamen] neque *pat.*

non] *om. Di L1 Na P1 P7 pat.*

5. uolentes] uolentibus Θ P2 P3 *pat.*

6. erecte] *om. P2 P3, eiecte P1*

7. qui] quid *M P2, quae pat.*

7/8. Et qui sunt porte destructe et ablate nisi predicatorum negligentes et tepidi] *om. Φ¹⁻⁴ N*

10. ascendistis] ascendisti *pat.*

10. ex aduerso in die Domini Ω *Le*] in die Domini ex aduerso *cett.*

Dicatur ergo: *Defixe sunt in terra porte eius*. Per terram enim uel amor terrenarum rerum uel humanitas Christi uel carnales obseruantie legis intelligi possunt. Bene ergo porte in terra defixe dicuntur, quia Scribe et Pharisei, doctores populi, propter hoc quod mentem in terrenis desideriis fixerant, non solum
5 Christum recipere noluerunt, immo etiam ne terram amitterent, Christum occiderunt. Vel in terra defixi sunt, quia solam in Christo carnem attendentes in laqueum perfidie inciderunt. **281C** Vel in terra defixi sunt, quia translata spirituali intelligentia legis ad gentes ipsi in carnalibus obseruantiiis remanserunt.

Vnde bene subditur: *Perdidit et contriuit uectes eius*. Quid enim uectes,
10 nisi occulta et fortia consilia Scribarum et Phariseorum designant, quibus consiliati sunt Christum occidere, ne terram perderent? Sed uectes perdidit et contriuit, quia consilium eorum ad nichilum redegit. Consilium perditum est, quia Christum occidendo extinguere non potuerunt. Consilium contritum est, quia ob hoc terram perdiderunt quod Christum occiderunt. Propter quod subditur: *Reges eius et*
15 *principes eius in gentibus*, subauditur, ‘constituit Deus’, ut scilicet gentiles regnent et principentur super eos. **281D** Sic igitur perditum est et contritum uectes, ut non solum regibus gentium tributum soluerent, sed etiam prefecti et presides regum inter eos habitarent, et eos opprimerent, tandemque rebelles a terra

4. mentem..fixerant: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1122B

1. Dicatur] Dicat Φ *om.* *M*

in terra porte eius] porte eius in terra Θ

5. terram] terram illam *pat.*

6/7. Vel in terra... inciderunt] *om.* Φ *Ba*

9. uectes eius] omnes uectes eius *Di* omnes in *marg.* *E*

11. Sed] Sic Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*

13. extinguere] interficere *T1 T2 T3*

15. gentiles] *om.* *T1 T2 T3*, gentes *Br Eb*

16. uectes] *om.* Φ^{1-4} *N*

perditi sunt et contriti uectes] perditum est uectes et contritum est Θ *Le*

eicerent et per totum mundum dissiparent. De quibus adhuc subditur: *Non est lex.* scilicet, *apud eos*; quia etsi libros legis habeant, quia tamen in Christum non credunt, legem non observant. Sed quia ipsi Christum suum adhuc sibi uenturum promittunt, contra hoc recte respondetur cum dicitur: ‘Prophete eius non
5 inuenerunt uisionem a Domino.’ Ac si diceretur: ‘Quod de aduentu Christi falso sibi blandientes predicunt, hoc a semetipsis non Domino reuelante inuenerunt.’

282A *Defixe sunt in terra porte eius.* Quid per portas anime nisi sensus corporis accipimus? Quas uidelicet portas tunc in terra defigimus, quando ipsos sensus nostros ad terrena desideria inclinamus. Sed quia nunquam foris sensus
10 turpibus desideriis succumbit, nisi prius interius mentis custodia per negligentiam fracta et dissipata fuerit, recte subinfertur cum dicitur: ‘Perdidit et contriuit uectes eius.’ Vectes etenim perdit, quando sublato timore bono mentem uagam et dissolutam relinquit. Vectes conterit quando ingredientibus uitii constantiam mentis frangi et emolliri permittit.

15 De quo sequitur: *Reges eius et principes eius in gentibus.* Per gentes enim uitia signantur. Reges ergo et principes anime in gentibus sunt, quando ipsa uitia ei per consensum dominari incipiunt. **282B** Vel per reges et principes ipsas anime uirtutes, per quas prius regebatur accipere possumus: reges, quia intus uoluntatibus president; principes, quia foris animum ad bene agendum mouent. Et
20 referendum est ad hoc quod premiserat: ‘perdidit et contriuit uectes eius’, uidelicet reges et principes, id est uirtutes perdidit et contriuit; in gentibus, id est per uitia frangi et opprimi permisit.

2/3. Non est...observant: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1122C

7/8. Quid...defigimus: cf. *ibid.*, 1123AB

1. eicerent] proicerent Φ

2. habeant] habebant Φ^2

quia tamen] et tamen Ω

in] *om.* Ω

5. diceretur] diceret *pat.*

falso] falsis *Ca1 Va2*

15. sequitur] subditur Φ^2 *Eb Le M Na P4 Wa*

Hinc est enim quod adiungit dicens: *Non est lex*. Animus enim legem intrinsecus habere debet, timorem uidelicet et amorem Dei, et ad huius legis iudicium sensus suos foris regere; timorem uidelicet, ne eum concupiscentia carnis per lasciuiam dissoluat; amorem uero, ne in bono opere desidia torpentem reddat.

5 **282C** Quod si forte portas suas, id est sensus suos animus in terrenis oblectamentis defigit, ipse sibi indicio est quod contritis uectibus, id est amissis uirtutibus etiam legem uite intrinsecus, scilicet timorem Dei et amorem perdidit.

Cui bene adhuc exprobrando dicitur: ‘Prophete eius non inuenerunt uisionem a Domino.’ Postquam enim animus amisso moderamine mentis iudicium
10 sensuum sequi incipit, iam solummodo ea refugit, que affectus sensuum mala esse renuntiat et ea sequitur que carnis affectus probat. Vnde necesse est eum sepe decipi, qui cum presentes solummodo delectationes considerat, futuras amaritudines non euitat. **282D** Hinc est quod tam sepe Moyses ad tabernaculum recurrit, ut Dominum consulat, quia nichil homo temere foris uel appetere uel
15 declinare debet, nisi prius intus quid Dei uoluntati placitum sit iudicio mentis discernat. Peruerse autem anime que affectum carnis non iudicium mentis ubique sequitur, recte hic per exprobrationem dicitur: ‘Prophete eius non inuenerunt uisionem a Domino.’ Quia ille profecto se in foueam perditionis precipitat, qui semper considerat quid carni sue dulce sit, et quid Deo placeat non attendit.

5/6. in terrenis oblectamentis: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1123A

1. enim] *om.* Φ^{1-2} P4

4. desidia] *om.* Δ^1 a.c. E

6. indicio] iudicio *Br1 Eb Le P3 Wa pat.*

7. scilicet] *om.* Θ

11. renuntiat] enuntiat Δ^1

14. Dominum] Deum *Br1 Eb Wa*

15. intus] intro Φ^1

quid] *om.* H a.c. E

17. hic] *om.* *Br1 Eb P4*

2:10 *Sederunt in terra etc.* Hucusque quasi destructionem edificiorum descripsit, deinceps miseriam et dolorem hominum plangit. *Sederunt in terra, conticuerunt senes.* Sessio deiectionem, silentium stuporem designat. **283A** Et congrue senes in quibus consilii auctoritas esse debuit siluisse dicuntur, quia tanta
5 calamitas fuit cui nullo consilio subueniri potuit.

Sequitur: *Consperserunt cinere capita sua uirgines.* Vltro speciem decoris sui fedant ut ipso squalore foris interni doloris uehementiam ostendant. Pulcre autem in tribulatione senes conticescunt. Virgines autem cinere capita sua spargunt, quia malum cum vehementer ingruit, maturos sensus in stuporem et
10 lasciuos ad impatientiam uertit. De quibus adhuc subditur: *Accincti sunt ciliciis.* Hoc ad senes. *Abiecerunt in terra capita.* Hoc ad uirgines. Mortem accelerare uolunt qui ingruentibus malis spontaneas etiam afflictiones adiciunt.

283B *Sederunt in terra, conticuerunt senes.* Prophete mens uniuersa mala presentis uite considerans, compunctionis oculum ab exordio ducens, ab ipso
15 primi hominis lapsu usque ad excecationem Iudaici populi, ac deinde descendens per mala presentis Ecclesie usque ad finem temporis planctum extendit. In superioribus enim edificia diruta menia destructa quasi a minori incipiens descripsit. Hinc iam quasi ad maiora progrediens hominum miseriam et dolorem plangit. Hec igitur que sequuntur non incongrue ad presentem Ecclesiam referri
20 possunt.

4. consilii auctoritas: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1123C: auctoritas religionis

11. Abiecerunt] Adiecerunt *G H O4*

15. excecationem] execrationem *O2*

18. Hinc] Hic Φ

Sederunt in terra, conticuerunt senes filie Syon. Quid per filiam Syon nisi presens Ecclesia accipitur, que de Synagoga per fidem nata est? **283C** Senes ergo filie Syon prelati Ecclesie dicuntur, quorum senectus non in numero annorum queritur, sed in prouectu sapientie et morum maturitate; Et bene senes quia non
5 paruuli sub lege quasi sub pedagogo constituti. Populus enim antiquus quasi paruulus erat quia per uirgam legis et per terrenas promissiones nutriebatur quousque ad sensum maturum conscenderet, ut Deo non pro terrenis sed pro celestibus deseruiet. Isti ergo senes filie Syon in terra sedere non debent, id est
10 terrena et transitoria querere, sed conuersatione et desiderio in celis esse ut quod uerbo predicant moribus ostendant. Sed quia plerosque Propheta in sancta Ecclesia futuros preuidit, qui prelacionis locum obtinentes peruersis moribus dignitatem officii sui macularent in uocem doloris erumpens sic ait: ‘Sederunt in terra senes filie Sion.’ **283D** Quid est enim in terra sedere nisi terrenis
15 delectationibus incumbendo a bono opere cessare? Sed quia hi qui a bono cessando peruersa agunt, ne sue prauitatis testes fiant, uerbum ueritatis loqui erubescunt recte secutus adiunxit ‘conticuerunt’. Quia profecto ubi conscientiam remordet reatus sceleris, a predicatione linguam ligat timor confusionis.

13/14. terrenis...incumbendo: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1123D

5. paruuli] ut paruuli *pat.*

7. quousque ad] quoad usque *E Di*

conscenderet] ascenderet Φ^2

13. est enim] enim est Θ

14. qui] *om.* Θ

17. linguam] *om.* Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*

Sequitur: *Consperserunt cinere capita sua uirgines Ierusalem*. Quid per uirgines Ierusalem nisi boni subiecti in Ecclesia qui fidei integritatem sinceritate morum conseruantes ad uisionem superne pacis festinant? Et quid per caput nisi actio spiritualis? **284A** Quid per cinerem qui ab igne relinquitur nisi terrene cogitationes signantur? Quasi enim ab igne cinis nascitur, quando cogitationum inanium reliquie a concupiscentia carnali generantur. Bene ergo postquam senes in terra sedent et tacent, uirgines capita sua cinere conspergunt, quia simplices quique in Ecclesia cum prelatos suos postposito studio predicationis terrenis delectationibus uident incumbere, etiam in bonis que agunt carnaliter delectari incipiunt. Recte autem senes filie Syon et uirgines Ierusalem nominauit, quia prelati in sancta Ecclesia per prouidentiam circumspectionis sublimes debent esse. Subiecti autem in bonis que humiliter peragunt, semper per intentionem mentis ad uisionem eterne pacis respicere, quatenus et illi in alto per uirtutem constituti ea que subiecta sunt custodiant, et isti per humilitatem in imo positi intentione semper ad superiora contendunt. **284B** Hoc ergo Propheta plangit quod sedent hi qui erecti esse debuerant et qui celestia contemplari consueuerant cinerem sibi superiniciunt ne uisum ad sublimia leuare queant. Et nota quod perfecti

12/13. per intentionem...respicere: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1125A

1. uirgines] filie *Ba N*

8. postposito studio predicationis] studio postposito predicationis $\Sigma^2 \Phi$

9. uident incumbere etiam in bonis] incumbere etiam in bonis cernunt Φ^2

15. contendunt] conscendant Δ^1 *a.c. E*

16. erecti] recti $\Phi^4 N$

17. superiniciunt] supermittunt Δ^2

etiam in pedibus puluerem habere dicuntur. Qui autem puluere capita sua aspergunt iam inter plangendos numerantur, quia in terrenis quidem actionibus boni per infirmitatem aliquando leues maculas contrahunt, mali uero in his etiam que fortiter agere uidentur per intentionem laudis sordescunt.

5 **284C** Sequitur: *Accincti sunt ciliciis*. Quid per cilicium nisi cura terrenarum rerum signatur, que conscientiam assiduis occupationum aculeis pungit? Prius ergo senes in terra sedentes describuntur, et postea ciliciis accincti, quia ubi mens in amore carnalium delectationum primum resoluta fuerit, mox
10 deinde cura sequitur que illam pro adimplendis desideriis suis sollicitando compungit. Virgines quoque prius capita sua cinere aspergere, ac postea ipsa capita sua in terram abicere dicuntur, quia hic perditionis ordo est, ut primum quisque bona que agit per intentionem laudis humane offuscet, ac deinde etiam ipsa bona opera in prauas actiones commutet.

Sederunt in terra, conticuerunt senes filie Syon. Per diuersas etates et
15 sexus atque officia personarum interni motus anime distinguuntur. **284D** Nam quod foris officia personarum discernunt, hoc intrinsecus affectionum motus discrete peragunt. Quid ergo per senes filie Syon nisi consilia fidelis anime accipere debemus? Sed sciendum est quod alia sunt electorum consilia et alia reproborum. Consilia namque electorum sunt presentem uitam et eius
20 delectationes despiciere, in aduersis patientiam conseruare, per presentes tribulationes ad futuram gloriam pertingere. Consilia reproborum sunt aduersa fugere presentem uitam amare, carnalibus desideriis morem gerere, uitam futuram aut despiciere aut desperare. De consilio impiorum per Psalmistam dicitur: ‘Beatus uir qui non abiit in consilio impiorum.’ **285A** Et de iustorum consilio in eodem

23/24. Beatus...impiorum: Ps. 1:1

2. in] *om.* Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*

6. aculeis] *stimulis Ba*

12. offuscet *Ba Ca1 O2 P4*] effuscet $\Delta \Theta \Sigma \Omega$, effocet Φ , obustet *Mu*, effulcet *Ca2 L2*

16. discernunt] *discernant pat.*

postea consequenter adiungitur: 'Ideo non resurgunt impii in iudicio neque peccatores in consilio iustorum.' Si ergo hi qui ad consilium iustorum conuertuntur surgunt, merito sedere perhibentur, qui in consilium impiorum dilapsi sunt, quia et illa sursum et ista deorsum tendunt, illa celum et ista terram appetunt. Senes ergo filie Syon in terra sedent, quando affectus anime eterne promissionis oblite terrenis et transitoriis delectationibus inherent. De quibus recte dicitur 'conticuerunt'. Internum enim desiderium quasi clamor quidam est in auribus Dei. Et ideo prava mens quanto magis foris transitoria appetit, tanto amplius intus a desiderio eternorum conticescit.

10 Sequitur: *Consperserunt cinere capita sua uirgines Ierusalem*. Per uirgines Ierusalem mundas anime cogitationes intelligere debemus. **285B** Quid est ergo quod postquam senes in terra sedent, uirgines cinere capita sua spargere dicuntur, nisi quod cum affectus anime deprauati sunt, statim caligo cogitationum generatur? Vnde adhuc subiungitur: *Accincti sunt ciliciis*. Post sessionem enim et
15 aspersionem cineris cilicium sequitur, quia post prauam delectationem et confusionem mentis aspera peccatrici conscientie de reatu sui sceleris compunctio generatur.

Postremo autem in fine cumulus infelicitatis apponitur cum subinfertur: *Abiecerunt in terra capita sua uirgines Iuda*. Post accinctionem enim cilicii,
20 capita in terra abicere est post angustiam et trepidationem male conscientie etiam de uenia desperare. **285C** Propter quod etiam recte uirgines Iuda dicuntur. Ad augmentum namque doloris postrema in eis confessio nominatur, quia et illa nouissima post omnes alias uirtutes amissas a desperatis excluditur.

1/2. Ideo...iustorum: Ps. 1:5

5/6. terrenis...inherent: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1125A

3. consilium] consilio $\Delta^2 \Phi$ Val pat.

13. cum] quando pat.

15. prauam] om. Δ^1 a.c. E

18. autem om. Σ^2

21. recte] om. Φ

2:11 *Defecerunt pre lacrimis oculi mei etc.* Propheta in persona Ecclesie membra sua plangentis enumeratis malis perditorum compassionem bonorum adiungit. Prius enim mali planguntur a bonis quam a semetipsis, et dum male sani in sua adhuc perditione exultant, quantum flendi sint aliena suspiria indicant. Dicat ergo: ‘Defecerunt pre lacrimis oculi mei. Conturbata sunt uiscera mea. Effusum est in terra iecur meum.’ Oculi in sancta Ecclesia sunt prouisoires, uiscera misericordes, iecur studiosi et in bono opere feruentes. **285D** Vt enim ferunt *physici*, in iecore calor decoctionis est. Sicut ergo iecur uel hepar suo calore crudum cibum in stomacho decoquit, et exinde succum nutritium in omnes corporis partes transmittit, sic nimirum hi qui alios per feruorem sue deuotionis a torpore ad bene operandum excitant quasi ex sua decoctione alimentum corpori Christi subministrant. Quid est ergo quod peccato uastante populum fidelem oculi Ecclesie deficiunt, et uiscera turbantur, iecur in terra effunditur, nisi quod hi qui uere caritatem Christi habent semper alienis miseriis compatiuntur? Sicut Apostolus dicit: ‘Quis infirmatur et ego non infirmor? Quis scandalizatur et ego non uror?’ **286A** Nullum enim certius indicium est uere caritatis quam affectus fraterne compassionis. Bene autem dixit oculos deficere pre lacrimis, quia sepe tam uehementi plaga uitam subditorum culpa exulcerat,

15/16. Quis..uror’: 2 Cor. 11:29

7/10: Vt enim...transmittit: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1126C

3. mali planguntur] planguntur mali Φ^{1-3}

10. deuotionis] decoctionis $\Delta^1 G$

16. Nullum] Nullus *P2 P3*

certius indicium est uere caritatis] indicium est certius uere caritatis Φ , certius indicium uere caritatis est Σ^2

affectus] affectus ibi $\Delta a.c. E$

17. Bene autem dixit] Benedixit oculos autem $\Delta^1 a.c. E$

ut omnis ratio et diligentia prelatorum succumbat, et iam in tantis malis aliud
consilium non sit nisi ad lacrimas solum confugere et diuinam clementiam
implorare. Hoc pulcre Psalmista significat dicens: ‘Turbati sunt et moti sunt sicut
ebrius, et omnis sapientia eorum deuorata est. Et clamauerunt ad Dominum cum
5 tribularentur, et de necessitatibus eorum liberauit eos.’ Bene ergo oculi pre lacrimis
deficiunt, quia sepe cum malum uehementer ingruit, discretionis oculum meror
caligare facit. Viscera turbantur quia intrinsecus affectus pietatis concutitur. **286B**
Iecur in terram effunditur, quia sepe in electis pro merore alieni periculi alacritas
mentis obligatur, ut tanto amplius etiam in semetipsis ad bona agenda reddantur
10 tepidi, quanto magis sunt in compassione fraterne tribulationis afflicti. Per oculos
igitur et uiscera et iecur significantur hi qui plangunt, non qui planguntur. Vnde et
mox per sequentia uerba de his qui planguntur sententiam adnectens causam
doloris exponit dicens: ‘Super contritione filie populi mei.’ Quid enim per
muliebre sexum nisi plebs infirma significatur quam tamen cum filiam nominat
15 fidei professionem habere demonstrat? Per contritionem autem irreparabilis
calamitas ostenditur, sicut quod contritum est amplius non reparatur.

3/4. Ps. 106:27/28

5. oculi] *om. Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

8. pro] *prae pat.*

10. tribulationis] *dilectionis Σ² p.c. E*

12. sequentia] *subsequentia Δ¹ a.c. E*

14. significatur] *signatur Ba Br1 Eb Wa*

15. irreparabilis] *inseparabilis Di P7*

286C Sequitur: *Cum deficeret paruulus et lactans in plateis oppidi.*

Determinat contritionem. Per paruulum populum rudem et fide simplicem, per lactantem prauos doctores, per plateas oppidi uoluptates huius seculi accipere debemus. Paruulus ergo et lactans in plateis oppidi deficiunt, quando carnales
5 quique et stulti cum peruersis doctoribus per latam uiam uoluptatum ad perditionem uadunt. Et nota quod ait ‘deficerent’. Magis enim sunt plangendi qui a bono deficiunt quam hi qui numquam boni fuerunt.

Defecerunt etc. Proprium est electorum aliena mala tanquam sua plangere. Sicut enim bonis congaudendo eorum meritis participes fiunt, ita quoque malis per
10 compassionem condolendo de illorum perditione sibi lucrum faciunt. **286D** Discat ergo peccator quomodo mala propria flere debeat cum iustus pro alienis delictis tanta contritione se affligat?

Defecerunt, inquit, *pre lacrimis oculi mei*. Quantum putatis compunctus erat iste qui sic plorauit? Non enim semel se lacrimas fudisse ostendit qui oculos
15 suos pre lacrimis defecisse dicit. Sed quia multi lacrimas fundunt et non compunguntur corde, secutus adiunxit: ‘Conturbata sunt uiscera mea’, id est usque ad cordis intima sagitta doloris penetrauit, dolor sensum tetigit et contremuit affectus pietatis.

6. deficerent] deficeret *Di*

9/10. eorum...condolendo] *om. T1 T2 T3*

10. sibi lucrum] si lucrum *T1 T2 T3*, lucrum sibi *Re*, luctum *Le P6*

12. se contritione affligat] se afflictione conterat *Le*

13. Quantum putatis] Quantum pietatis Φ^1 Φ^2 , Quantum studio pietatis *N P4*, Quantum pietate *D1 P5*, Quante pietatis Φ^3

14. semel se] semel tantum se *pat.*

17. usque] *om. T1 T2 T3*

et] *om. Σ^2 p.c. E*

Sequitur: *Effusum est in terra iecur meum*. Quid per effusionem iecoris nisi afflictio carnis signatur? **287A** Nam quia in iecore decoctio stomachi calorem accipit, qui in afflictione sui corporis curam postponunt, quid aliud quam iecur in terram effundunt? Ne igitur inanes lacrimae, ne ficta suspiria, ne simulati gemitus credantur, ecce carnis afflictio manifesta sequitur. Sed fortassis pro parentibus aut cognatis dolet iste. Audite quid dicat: ‘Super contritione’, inquit, ‘filie populi mei.’ Non patris, non matris, non fratris, non sororis, non cognati, non affinis, sed ‘populi mei’ inquit, ne affectus carnis et non caritatis stimulus doloris putaretur. Sed, credo, famosos et diuites in populo iste planctu suo honorat. Attendite quid dicat: ‘Cum deficeret, inquit, paruulus et lactans.’ In primis animaduertite discretionem. Plangit quod deficiunt, nec plangit quod diuites non sunt. **287B** Quis? ‘Paruulus’, inquit, ‘et lactans.’ Videte quia infirmitati compatitur, non fortitudinem aut pompam ueneratur. Sed adhuc fortassis in infirmitate sexus et etatis honorat nobilitatem generis. ‘In plateis’, inquit, ‘oppidi.’ Non in aula, non in urbe, non in ciuitate, non saltem in domo, sed in plateis oppidi, quia quanto maior est contritorum abiectio, tanto grauior est ideoque pretiosior dolentis compassio.

2. afflictio] affectio *Di P7*

signatur] significatur Φ^4

9. planctu] *om.* Φ^1

10. animaduertite] aduertite Φ^2

10/12. In primis...lactans] *om.* *T1 T2 T3*

15. quia] quod *pat.*

16. ideoque pretiosior] et periculosior Δ^1 *a.c. E*

Defecerunt etc. Quid per oculos nisi claritas contemplationis, et quid per uiscera nisi sensus interne dulcedinis, et quid per iecur nisi feruor diuini amoris accipitur? **287C** Quid est ergo quod Propheta in contritione filie populi sui oculos suos defecisse et uiscera conturbata iecurque effusum in terram commemorat, nisi
5 quod spiritualis quisque quanto magis animum suum in tribulatione proximorum ad compassionem foras effundit, tanto amplius interna illa gaudia que quietus gustare consueuerat ex ipsa meroris sui perturbatione subtracta deplorat?

Sequitur: *Super contritione* etc. Per filiam populi carnalis anima, per paruulum sensus carnis, per lactantem uirtus mentis accipitur. Sensus enim carnis,
10 quantum in se est, puerilia quedam et leuia semper appetit nisi quantum mentis constantia eum per disciplinam restringit. Quasi paruulus igitur lacte pascitur quia per uirtutem animi ad maturitatem constantie uelut ad robur uirile paulatim enutritur.

287D Sequitur: *In plateis oppidi*. Per oppidum non incongrue corpus
15 quod anima inhabitat, et per plateas oppidi fluxa desideria carnis intelligere possumus. Quare ergo in contritione filie populi paruulus et lactans in plateis oppidi deficere dicuntur, nisi quod in anima carnali prius per illecebrosa desideria foris sensus corrumpitur, ac deinde uirtus quoque ac constantia animi emollitur?

9. per paruulum...mentis: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1127D

6. effundit] effudit Φ^1

2:12 *Matribus suis dixerunt* etc. In matribus tenerior affectus dilectionis notatur que filiorum affectus si potest non solum audit sed preuenit. Cur igitur filios rogantes expectant nisi quia non habent quod egentibus offerant? Et ne maternam pietatem naturali uitio induruisse existimes, audi quales se olim filiis exhibuerint.

- 5 **288A** Non petunt hordeum et aquam, scilicet alimenta seruilia, quia nichil eiusmodi dare solebant. Sed ‘ubi est’, iniquiunt, ‘triticum et uinum’? Hoc petunt quod soliti fuerunt accipere. Non tamen petunt, sed admirantes interrogant, quia nec petere solebant, sed habere. Sed fortassis dices, lasciui erant filii isti, et delicati superflua querebant, quibus etiam materna pietas contradicere deberet.
- 10 Audi quid sequitur: ‘Cum deficerent’, inquit, ‘quasi uulnerati in plateis ciuitatis.’ Duplex malum; egestas et ignominia. Tolerabilius saltem fuisset in domo deficere et in occulto fame consumi quam in plateis cum tabe famis confusionem ignominie sustinere.

288B Sequitur: *Cum exhalarent animas suas in sinu matrum suarum.*

- 15 Omnia cooperantur ad malum. In plateis deficiunt. In sinu matrum animas exhalant, ut et manifesta tabes confusionem et mors presens dolorem multiplicent.

Matribus suis etc. Prelati sancte Ecclesie senes prudentia atque consilio et matres pietate esse debent. Sed quia prauī quique et negligentes cum locum prelationis obtinent, curam subiectorum postponunt, et sue potius auaritie aut

20 luxui student, recte nunc per Prophetam dicitur: ‘Matribus suis dixerunt: “Vbi

5/6. Non petunt...solebant: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1128C

2. audit] audiunt *P7 pat.*

preuenit] preueniunt *P7 pat.*

3. offerant] offeratur Φ^{1-3} *Ba*

5. petunt hordeum et aquam] petuntur hordeum et aqua $\Sigma^2 \Phi^{1-2} \Phi^4$ *E*, petuntur hordeum et aquam $\Sigma^1 \Omega$ *H*

11. saltem] tamen Φ

18. prauī] parui Φ^{1-2}

quique] quilibet *pat.*

est triticum et uinum?”” Magnus dolor; quod petentibus subtrahunt hoc etiam non petentibus offerre debuerunt. Sciendum autem quod tribus modis uita subditorum prelati loquitur: per miseriam, per desiderium, per obedientiam. **288C** Petunt enim quando indigent. Petunt quando desiderant. Petunt quando audire parati sunt. Per miseriam petunt quia uisa afflictorum indigentia, dum pias mentes ad subueniendum prouocat, etiamsi lingua silet, uita clamat. Per desiderium quoque petunt, quia quodammodo petere est uelle habere. Item per obedientiam petunt, quia dum paratos se ad recipiendum offerunt quasi uelle et desiderare se dicunt. Negligentibus igitur prelati subiectorum, etsi non lingua, uita tamen semper loquitur, quia et malorum periculo et bonorum desiderio, atque obedientia ad predicationis studium et bone conuersationis exemplum impendendum commonentur. **288D** Et attendite quod in tempore necessitatis filii non patres sed matres uocant. Ac si dicant: ‘Si debitum obliti estis, pietatem saltem obliuisci non debetis.’ ‘Erubescant canes muti et non ualentes latrare.’ Erubescant qui de pastoribus lupi facti sunt. Erubescant qui non sicut pastores, sed sicut mercenarii gregem dominicum pascunt, qui ad laniandum sunt fortes et ad protegendum sunt imbecilles, ad accipiendum prompti, ad tribuendum pigri, ad circumueniendum disert, ad benedicendum indocti, qui plus debito exigunt, minus, uel nichil, debito impendunt, qui iudicia ueritatis in causas forenses mutauerunt. Ve eis quare non attendunt quid debeant, et si petitionem preuenire noluerunt saltem petentes audiant, quia et in ipsa fortassis petitione discere etiam poterunt quid debeant.

14. Erubescant...latrare: Is. 56:10

1. quod] quia quod *pat.*

5. quia] quando Φ^1

6. silet] sileat Φ

12. commonentur] commouentur *L2 O2 pat. a.c. L1*

18. benedicendum] obediendum Δ^1 *a.c. E*

289A ‘Vbi est’, iniquiunt illi, ‘triticum et uinum?’ Non petunt hordeum et
aquam, sed triticum et uinum. Videamus ergo quid sit istud triticum et uinum et
quare hordeum et aquam non petant filii, quamuis in necessitate famis sint
constituti. In Euangelio legimus quod quinque milia hominum quinque panibus
5 hordeaceis pasta sunt. Postea uero quattuor milia satiantur et tamen nichil ibi
dicitur de panibus hordeaceis. Item legimus in Euangelio quod sex hydrie lapidee
prius aqua implete sunt, postea uero aque ipse in uinum commutate. De tritico
quoque in Euangelio Dominus ipse mentionem facit dicens: ‘Nisi granum frumenti
cadens in terram mortuum fuerit, ipsum solum manet. Si autem mortuum fuerit,
10 multum fructum affert.’ 289B Quid igitur per triticum nisi Christus, quid per
hordeum nisi lex, quid per aquam nisi carnalis sensus, quid per uinum nisi
spiritualis intelligentia accipitur? Seruis igitur qui sensu carnali legem tenuerunt,
hordeum et aqua sufficere poterant. Filii autem qui iam per gratiam in Christo
adoptati sunt et Christum spiritualiter edere sciunt, non nisi triticum et uinum
15 desiderant. Hec omnia inquit Apostolus, uidelicet legales obseruantias ‘reputaui ut
stercora, ut Christum lucrifacerem.’ Vide quomodo iste hordeum legis abicit

4/5. quinque...pasta sunt: cf. Matt. 16: 9/10

5/6. quattuor...hordeaceis: cf. Marc. 6:44

8/10. Nisi granum...affert: Ioh: 12:24

15/16. reputaui...lucriferem: Phil. 3:8

8/10. Ioh: 12:24: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1128CD

1. illi] *om.* Φ^1

2. ergo] *om.* $\Phi^1 \Phi^4$

istud] *om.* Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*

7. prius] *om.* Φ

10. igitur] ergo *Di Ol p.c. E*, autem Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*

12. spiritualis intelligentia Ω] intelligentia spiritualis *cett.*

sensu carnali] carnali sensu Δ^1

13. hordeum et aqua] et hordeum et aqua *Br I Eb N P4 N Wa*

15. reputaui] arbitror *pat.*

et non nisi triticum, hoc est Christum edere querit. Et bene per hordeum quod asperum est ad edendum lex, et per triticum quod suaue est et dulce Christus accipitur, quia lex uenit peccata punire et Christus soluere. **289C** Quare ergo Christus triticum dicatur iam per Dei gratiam et legendo discimus et edendo
5 sentimus. Quatuor autem modis Christum comedimus. Christum comedimus quando corporaliter sacramentum corporis et sanguinis eius sumendo spiritualiter animas nostras saginamus. Christum edimus quando Christum credendo diligimus. Christum edimus quando Christum imitamur. Christum edimus quando uerbum Dei audiendo in noue uite conuersionem transimus. Quid est ergo querere
10 triticum nisi querere Christum, querere uerbum Dei, doctrinam ueritatis et conuersionem noui hominis? Triticum igitur querimus quando uerbum uite audire et Christum imitari desideramus. **289D** Sed si triticum edimus, uinum et non aquam bibere debemus, id est uerbum Dei audiendo sumere et per spiritualem intelligentiam illud in nobis irrigare. Hoc est enim quod in lege nobis precipitur ne
15 carnes agni pascalis aqua coquamus, quia carnaliter nobis sapere non debet quod ad pastum spiritualem datum est. Interrogent ergo boni subiecti malos prelatos suos et dicant: ‘Vbi est triticum?’ Ac si aperte dicerent: ‘Vbi est doctrina ueritatis, ubi exempla noui hominis?’ Ac si apertius dicerent: ‘Vos nec loquendo ueritatem ostenditis, nec bene uiuendo imitatione dignos exhibetis.’ ‘Vbi est uinum?’

14/15. in lege...coquamus: cf. Ex. 12:9

5/6. Christum...corporaliter] *om. P2 P3*, comedimus] *enim edimus pat.*

7. credendo] edendo Δ^1 *a.c. E*

17. suos] *om. Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

18. aperte] *om. P2 a.c. P3*

Quasi dicerent: ‘Vos qui etiam spiritualia carnaliter tractatis, quomodo nos de carnalibus ad spiritualia euocare poteritis? **290A** Vos qui terrena que abiecisse uidebamini obliuisci non potestis, quomodo nos ad obliuionem eorum que possidemus inebriabitis? Manducate prius et postea reficite. Inebriamini et deinde

5 inebriate.’ Proh pudor! Quid dicemus ad hec? Quid mirum est si populus carnalia diligit, quando clerus spiritualia etiam pro carnalibus uendit? Vnde recte subinfertur cum dicitur: ‘Cum deficerent quasi uulnerati in plateis ciuitatis.’ Due sunt ciuitates: Babylonia et Ierusalem. Sed Babylonia plateas habet, id est uias

10 latas que ducunt ad mortem. In plateis ergo ciuitatis deficiunt qui per carnis illecebras defluentes a uirtute mentis emollescunt. Vel per ciuitatem ipsam Ecclesiam non inconuenienter accipimus. Habet namque sancta Ecclesia plateas, habet et semitas. **290B** Quid enim terrene actiones sunt nisi quedam platee, et quid spirituales actiones nisi semite? In plateis ergo ciuitatis sunt qui in sancta Ecclesia licite terrenis actionibus inseruiunt. In plateis autem ciuitatis deficiunt qui

15 terrenis negotiis occupati spirituales consolatores non inueniunt, qui profecto nequaquam deficerent, si detrimenta, que foris sepe patiuntur, consilio et admonitione bonorum prelatorum intus semper repararent. Vnde bene de eiusmodi dicitur quasi uulnerati. Quid enim peccata sunt nisi uulnera? Quasi uulnerati igitur deficiunt qui sic per negligentiam

8/9. plateas... ad mortem: cf. Matth. 7:13

4/5. inebriabitis... inebriamini...: cf. ibid., 1129B

8/9. plateas... ad mortem: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1129A

1. etiam] *om.* Σ^2 *p.c.* *E*

4. inebriabitis] inebriatis Δ^1 *a.c.* *E* Θ Φ^{1-4}

10. inconuenienter] incongruenter Φ , incongrue *N*

15. consolatores] consolationes *Ba P4 Wa*

16. nequaquam] non Φ^4

17. repararent] repararentur *pat.*

sicut alii per culpam ad interitum tendunt. 290C Cum magno igitur dolore pronuntiandum est *quasi uulnerati*. Ac si diceretur: ‘Cur isti per negligentiam prelatorum pereunt qui criminibus et flagitiis uulnerati non sunt?’

Vnde sequitur: *Cum exhalarent animas suas in sinu matrum suarum*.

- 5 Quid namque est sinus matrum nisi blanda adulatio prelatorum? Quasi morientes namque filios matres in sinu tenent, quando carnalium mentes in torpore suo pereuntes mali prelati non solum ad bonam operationem non exsuscitant, sed etiam blandis fauoribus palpando in sua perditione fouent.

- Matribus suis dixerunt* etc. Quid spiritualiter per filios matrum nisi
10 multitudinem cogitationum accipere debemus? Que dum in una mente de diuersis affectionibus prodeunt, quasi multarum matrum soboles in una domo sed non ex una origine procedunt? 290D De affectionibus autem cogitationes nasci iccirco diximus, quia profecto illarum rerum frequentissime memoria nobis per cogitationem occurrit, quarum amore affecti sumus. Hoc per singula uitia atque
15 uirtutes facile uerum probamus. Hinc est enim quod in Euangelio dicitur: ‘Vbi est thesaurus tuus, ibi est cor tuum.’ Ac si diceretur: ‘Vbi est amor tuus, ibi est animus tuus. Qualis est affectio tua, talis etiam est cogitatio tua.’ Sed sciendum est quod sicut affectus de se cogitationes generant, sic ipse rursum cogitationes eos a quibus oriuntur affectus amplius inflammant. Vnde etiam in his qui cor suum

15/16. Vbi est...cor tuum: Matth. 6:21

10. multitudinem cogitationum: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1129B

3. non] *om.* Φ^2 Ba N

6. torpore] corpore Σ P7 pat., opere Cal

12. procedunt] prodeunt Ba Cal Br Eb Wa

17. animus] cogitatio Wa

etiam] *om.* N, enim P7 pat.

18. generant] generat Φ

rursum] rerum Φ^1

ab illicitis cogitationibus diligenter custodiunt, funditus tandem malarum affectionum radices arescunt. **291A** Econtra uero illi qui mentem suam meditationibus sanctis exercere negligunt, etiamsi aliqua diuini amoris scintilla prius incaluerint paulatim tepescunt, ita tandem ut etsi forte bonarum affectionum cogitationes aliquando habuerint, nichil ex ipsis interne dulcedinis in sinum mentis uel tenuiter eliquari presentiant. Propter quod recte in hoc loco dicitur: ‘Matribus suis dixerunt: “Vbi est triticum et uinum?”’ Quid enim per triticum nisi cibus sapientie, et quid per uinum nisi internum gaudium signatur? Nam sicut panis corporeus uentrem reficit, sic sapientia mentem pascit, et sicut uinum auide potatum ebriat, sic internum gaudium mentem a carnalibus desideriis alienat. **291B** Quid est ergo quod filii famelici a matribus triticum et uinum querunt, nisi quod cogitationes de bonis affectionibus nate, sed per negligentiam arefacte, pristinae dulcedinis saporem in eis inuenire non possunt? De quibus recte subditur: *Cum deficerent quasi uulnerati in plateis ciuitatis*. Quid enim sunt platee ciuitatis nisi uagationes mentis? In plateis ergo ciuitatis deficiunt quia dum uaga mens eas ad internam quietem non colligit usque ad gustum intimi saporis

2. affectionum] cogitationum Φ

arescunt] non arescunt *p.c. Di*

5. nichil] nihil tamen *pat.*

8. signatur] significatur *Ba P4*

9/10. auide potatum] potatum auide Φ

10. ebriat] debriat *Le P2 P3*

11. matribus] matribus suis Φ

12. de] a $\Phi^4 N$

13. subditur] dicitur $\Phi^1 \Phi^4$

non pertingunt. Quibus hoc etiam bene congruit quod dicitur ‘quasi uulnerati.’
Praua quippe desideria uulnera sunt bonarum cogitationum, quia dum sua eas
admixtione inficiunt, quasi plage quedam integritatem rectitudinis earum
corrumpunt. **291C** Bene ergo steriles cogitationes anime quasi uulnerati deficere
5 dicuntur, quia sic a fructu iustitiae inanes permanent, sicut ille qui per illicita
desideria corrupte sunt.

Sequitur: *Cum exhalarent animas suas in sinu matrum suarum.* Sinus
matrum tepor et desidia est bonarum affectionum, in quo merito paruuli cogitatus
animas exhalare dicuntur, quia cum mens a feruore diuini amoris tepescit, omnis
10 mox bonarum cogitationum uigor emoritur.

2:13 *Cui comparabo te* etc. Paulatim planctum promouet. Primum edificia,
deinde homines et ipsos quasi absentes luxit, nunc tandem uelut emollitis et
assuefactis longo fletu animis ad presentes uerba conuertit dicens: ‘Cui
comparabo te et cui assimilabo te?’ Ac si diceret: ‘Quia tam magna est contritio
15 tua, cui comparabo te, et quia tam grauis est, cui assimilabo te?’ **291D** Quod est
aperte dicere: ‘Mala tua et magnitudine et modo omnem miseriam superant.’ Sed
quia etiam magna minimis quadam differenti similitudine comparari aliquando
possunt subdit: *Et exequabo te* etc. Quod est dicere: ‘Alia mala etsi per
differentiam quandam tibi comparari possunt, sed nulla per equalitatem possunt.
20 Quare? Sequitur: *Magna enim uelut mare contritio tua.* Mirum est quod
calamitatem eius nulli coequari posse commemorat, et statim magnitudinem maris

7. suarum] *om.* Δ¹

12. deinde] et deinde *Ma P2 Val*

15. est] *es pat.*

19. sed] tamen *pat.*

21. coequari] comparari Ω *G*

ei in comparatione coequat. Sed sic intelligendum est ac si diceret:
'Quemadmodum mare super omnes alias aquas et mole et amaritudine excellens
est, ita tue contritioni nulla calamitas coequari potest.'

5 **292A** Sequitur: *Quis medebitur tui?* Sicut exsiccari non potest aqua de
mari, sic contritio tua ab homine reparari non poterit; nec est in quo speres nisi
solus Deus.

10 *Cui comparabo te?* Illi qui post agnitam ueritatem retro abeunt peiores
sunt his qui nunquam ueritatem agnouerunt. Et quanto cuique excellentior gradus
est, tanto periculosior est lapsus. Vnde Propheta cum superius malorum
15 prelatorum in Ecclesia negligentiam et subiectorum interitum planxisset, statim
secutus adiunxit: *Cui comparabo te et cui assimilabo te et exequabo te, uirgo
filia Syon?* Inculcatio uerborum magni doloris uim exprimit. Ac si ipsi Ecclesie de
membris eius arefactis loquatur et dicat: 'Sicut prius cum fidem recte uiuendo
15 cecideris, nulli comparabilis est ignominia tua.'

20 **292B** Sequitur: *Magna uelut mare contritio tua.* Quid per mare nisi uita
secularis accipitur? Que dum semper motu instabili, nunc de aduersis ad prospera,
nunc de prosperis in aduersa trahitur, quasi quibusdam procellis fluctuantibus
exagitatur. Et quiaⁿ nunquam uel in prosperis timorem uel in aduersis dolorem
20 excludit, quasi mare in quancumque partem refluat, amaritudinem

9/10. quanto cuique...est lapsus: cf. Jer. *Ep.* 130.7

12. Inculcatio uerborum: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1130A

14/15. nulli comparabilis...ignominia tua: cf. *ibid.*

4/5. de mari] maris *pat.*

5. reparari] aestimari *pat.*

8. agnouerunt] cognouerunt Φ

excellenter] excelsior $\Phi^1 \Phi^{3-4} N$, celsior Φ^2

15. nulli] *om.* $\Delta^1 a.c. E$

non amittit. Dicatur ergo illi que a dulcedine spiritualis uite per concupiscentiam
carnalem et curas seculares amarescit, dicatur: ‘Magna enim uelut mare contritio
tua.’ Ac si aperte diceretur: ‘Tu que per mundi contemptum et desiderium
eternorum bonorum ab amore carnali dulcorata fuisti, quomodo iterum in
5 amaritudinem uersa es?’

292C Sequitur: *Quis medebitur tui?* Audiant hoc prelati Ecclesie qui
medici animarum constituti sunt, audiant quod dicitur: ‘Quis medebitur tui?’ Ac si
diceretur: ‘Alios egros medici curant, sed medicos infirmantes quis curabit? Si
populus peccat, orant sacerdotes pro eo. Sed pro sacerdotibus si peccauerint, quis
10 orabit? Periculosa prorsus hec sunt et tamen uera. Que etsi audire timemus,
negare tamen non possumus.

Cui comparabo te etc. Increpatur anima peccatrix cuius tanta mala
superius numerata sunt, que ab amore Dei fornicata tanto turpiorem incestum
suum fecit, quanto pretiosior fuit integritas eius. **292D** Cui bene dicitur: ‘Magna
15 enim uelut mare contritio tua.’ Quid enim per mare nisi conscientia praua
accipitur, quam et memoria preteritorum scelerum et delectatio presentium huc
illucque impellendo exagitant. Quasi enim fluctus quidam e regione uenientes ad
inuicem se collidunt, quando infelicem animam quodammodo semper et penitentia
preteritorum errorum suorum retrahit, et amor presentium impellit. Et quia in hac
20 tanta contradictione illa qualiscunque misere delectationis dulcedo semper
admixto dolore inficitur, recte praua conscientia non solum inquietudine, sed
etiam amaritudine mare appellatur.

6. Audiant hoc prelati Ecclesie] Audiant prelati Ecclesie hoc Φ

13. numerata] enumerata Di

Sequitur: *Quis medebitur tui?* Ostendit magnum prorsus et difficile esse, non tamen Deo impossibile, ut talis ad sanitatem redeat. **293A** Hinc est quod Ioannes de peccante ad mortem dicit: ‘Non pro eo dico ut oret quis.’ Ac si diceret: ‘Sicut desiderare salutem eius non prohibeo, sic orare pro eo precipere non presumo, quia tam mortalis uulneris curatio, quamuis potentiam Dei non excedat, omnem tamen humanam existimationem superat, et ideo consideratius agitur, si interim humiliter suppressa oratione desiderium tantum Deo offeratur, quia fortassis citius impetrabit in causa tam difficili humilis et timorata deuotio quam petitio presumptuosa.’ Dicat ergo: ‘Quis medebitur tui?’ Quasi dicat: 10 ‘Periculosa est plaga tua, cui per humanam industriam subueniri non potest et que propter culpam preteritam a Deo sanari digna non est.’

2:14 293B *Prophete tui* etc. Cum exprobatione dicitur: ‘Prophete tui’. Ac si diceretur: ‘Ecce ad quantam miseriam deuoluta es prophetas falsos audiendo, quos tu dilexisti, et prophetas Dei uera dicentes audire noluisti. *Viderunt tibi*. Tibi uiderunt quia prophete tui fuerunt. Ideo mendacium illorum ad te redundauit, quia malitia illorum tibi placuit. *Prophete tui uiderunt tibi*. Quid tibi uiderunt? Falsa et stulta. Falsa in quibus decepta es. Stulta in quibus excusari non potes. Si tantum falsa uidissent, in quibus saltem fuisset aliqua ueritatis similitudo,

¹
3. Ioh. 5:16 non pro illo dico ut roget

1. magnum prorsus] prorsus magnum Φ

3. eo] illo Ω

oret] roget Φ^2

8. fortassis citius impetrabit in causa tam difficili] fortassis in causa tam difficili citius impetrabit Φ

9. dicat] dicit *pat.*

poterat fortassis excusari per ignorantiam simplicitas tua. Nunc autem quia stulta
 etiam uiderunt et tamen credere non timuisti, merito punitur insipientia tua. **293C**
 Que autem falsa et stulta uiderunt? Falsas assumptiones, ecce stulta. Falsas
 eiectiones, ecce falsa. Quando et quibus uolebant promittebant prospera, quando
 5 et quibus uolebant minabantur aduersa. Sed utrumque falso, quia eiciendis
 promittebant assumptiones et assumendis eiectiones. Quando Deus iratus erat,
 nuntiabant quod te ad protegendum assumeret. Quando placatus fuit, minabantur
 quod te ad tribulandum eiceret. Sed comminatio falsa fuit et promissio stulta. In
 promissione non tantum falsitas sed stultitia, quia etsi terrores timuisti, ualde
 10 alienum est a ratione quod tanti sceleris conscia uanis promissionibus decipi
 potuisti. **293D** Ecce nesciebas quod futurum fuerat, non tamen ignorabas malum
 meritum tuum quod presens erat. Ipsi autem falsa et stulta uidendo non aperiebant
 tibi iniquitatem tuam, quia cum peruersis in suo scelere prospera promitterent, et
 simpliciter gradientes uanis terroribus sollicitarent, non aperiebant, immo uelabant
 15 iniquitatem tuam ne eam agnosceres. Vel aliter distingui potest. Quod dixit falsa
 et stulta, hoc pertinet ad promissiones, quod autem sequitur⁶ falsas assumptiones
 et falsas eiectiones⁷, utrumque referendum est ad terrores. Tribulationem namque
 et eiectionem uocat eo quod populus a Deo eiciendus erat, et assumptionem ad
 similitudinem oneris quod assumptum portantem grauat. **294A** Hinc est enim
 20 quod ubi beatus Ieronimus transtulit ‘onus’ Babylonis siue Tyri siue Damasci etc.,
 Symmachus et Theodotion ‘assumptio’ interpretati sunt. Et bene propter
 supradictam causam terrores solummodo falsos uocat,

19/21. Hinc est...interpretati sunt: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1131C (Symmachus...interpretati sunt: ibid.)

5. minabantur] *om. Br1 Eb P4 Wa*

falso] *falsum pat.*

11. fuerat] *erat Θ*

22. supradictam] *predictam Ba Le*

promissiones autem non solum falsas sed et stultas nominat, quia etsi homo quid futurum sit non possit semper agnoscere, stultum ualde est in presenti semetipsum ignorare. Vnde statim postquam dixerat: ‘Viderunt tibi falsa et stulta, subiungit: ‘Nec aperiebant tibi iniquitatem tuam.’ Qui enim peccatori premium iusti promittit, 5 quasi iniquitatem illius ne uideatur abscondit.

Prophete tui etc. Sicut culpa malis prelati est quod per eorum negligentiam subiecti pereunt, ita quoque subiectis in culpam reputatur, quod spretis bonis malorum prelatores exempla imitantur et peruersas doctrinas audiunt. **294B** Congrue igitur postquam prelatores peruersitatem arguit, nunc ad 10 ipsos quoque subiectos uerba doloris per exprobrationem conuertit dicens: ‘Prophete tui uiderunt tibi falsa et stulta.’ Prelati Ecclesie prophete sunt, quando ad instruendam fidem moresque subiectorum, nunc occulta Scripturarum reserant, nunc de premiis bonorum siue penis malorum uentura predicunt. Peruersi autem quique quia in loquendo non tam correctionem audientium quam fauorem 15 querunt, recte nunc de eis dicitur: ‘Viderunt tibi falsa et stulta.’ Falsa etenim et stulta uident, quia in discernendis moribus subiectorum iudicium ueritatis non tenent. **294C** Et cum prauos quoslibet pro gratia fauoris in suis peruersitatibus laudant, stultos per negligentiam amplius per adulationem infatuant. Vnde recte subditur: *Nec aperiebant tibi iniquitatem tuam ut te ad penitentiam prouocarent.* 20 Quia uero nonnunquam mali prelati subiectos etiam innocentes odio

1. falsos] falsum Φ

7. reputatur] deputatur *pat.*

12. occulta] opaca *CaI*

reserant] referunt *H*, refert *G*

13. uentura] futura *BrI Eb P4 Wa*

16. quia] quando Φ

persequuntur et cum suas iniurias uindicerent causam Dei se patrocinari simulant.
recte subinfertur cum dicitur: ‘Viderunt autem tibi assumptiones falsas et
eiectiones.’ Ac si diceretur: ‘Quibus ipsi irati fuerant, illis iram et ultionem
diuinam imminere nuntiabant, quatenus cum Deum iniuriarum suarum ultorem
5 dicerent, animos populi ad exhibendam sibi reuerentiam prouocarent.’

294D *Prophete tui* etc. Qui sunt prophete peccatricis anime qui falsa et
stulta ei uident nisi foris sensus corporis et uersuti cogitatus intrinsecus, quos
prouidentia carnis gignit? Consideremus paulo attentius quam falsi sint isti
prophete. Ecce unus de illis, uisus, quomodo falsa prophetando decipit. Si rem
10 uideris concupiscibilem, quid tibi predicit? ‘Ama,’ inquit, ‘sequere, apprehende.
fruere. Felix eris si tali desiderio potitus fueris.’ Sed infelix anima dum male
credula fallacem promissionem sequitur, ampliori miseria per effectum sceleris
obligatur. Sic auditus, sic olfactus, sic gustus et tactus falsa prophetant et
credentes sibi illaqueant, quia priusquam concupiscentia experimentum capiat,
15 prospera omnia et blanda futura promittunt, cum uero misera delectatio breui
degustata transierit, stupentem et horrore plenam conscientiam relinquunt. 295A
Sed isti prophete tanto facilius in suis fallaciis deprehendi possunt, quanto

8. prouidentia carnis] cf. Rom. 8:6 (prudencia carnis)

1. persecuntur] prosequuntur *V pat.*

Dei se patrocinari] Dei patrocinari se Σ^2 *Di L2*, se Dei patrocinari Δ^1

3. iram et ultionem] iram et indignationem atque ultionem diuinam Φ^2

7. ei] eis Σ^1

8. prouidentia] prudentia Φ^1 *Ba P4*

sint] sunt Σ^2

12. effectum] affectum Δ^1 *a.c. E*

13. falsa] *om.* Δ^1 *a.c. E*

manifestius est et ratione sepe carens hoc quod promittunt. Versutia autem cordis tanto periculosior est, quanto occultior quia non solum fallaciter promittit, sed etiam mentem ad credendum astute quadam faciendi ratione compellit. Hec est prudentia carnis que mortem operatur quam filii nequam huius seculi habent, sicut

5 Dominus in Euangelio ait: 'Filii huius seculi prudentiores sunt filiis lucis in generatione sua.' Hec prudentia peruersos illos prophetas generat, uersutos scilicet anime cogitatus, qui falsis promissionibus animam lactant et consentientem sibi seducunt atque illaqueant. **295B** Vnus eorum patientie insidiatur, alter castitatem uiolare nititur. Ille mundi contemptum irridet, iste simulationi

10 studendum docet. Consideremus hec per singula. Est unus cogitatus qui de prudentia carnis nascitur. Hic dicit homini: 'Vindica lesionem tuam, ulciscere iniurias tuas, quia si presentes patienter tuleris ad futuras alios animabis. Timeant te potius homines quam contempnant. Omnes tibi exhibebunt reuerentiam si te uiderint ulcisci uiriliter iniuriam tuam.' Videte quam fallax et quam falsus est

15 propheta iste pessimus. Callide persuasisse putabatur cum furibundo reuerentiam exhibendam prediceret, quem cum in furorem conuerterit, non reuerendum sed abominabilem omnibus hominibus reddit.

5/6. Filii...in generatione sua: Luc. 16:8

5/6.Luc. 16:8: cf. Pasch., *In Lam.* 1131D/1132A

6. generat uersutos] generat per uersutos Φ^{1-2} , peruersutos *N*

17. omnibus] *om.* Φ

295C Est adhuc alius pseudopropheta, integritatis et continentie inimicus, qui hoc ordine seducit hominem. Sepe sub obtentu sanitatis aut necessitate operis amplioribus et deliciaribus cibis indulgendum suadet. Cum autem per crapulam corpus inflammauerit, continuo luxurie oblectamenta oculis anteponit, graue aut
5 impossibile asserit ut homo in carne positus non carnaliter uiuat, iuuenilibus annis facile ignosci, posse longa adhuc ad penitentiam superesse tempora, Deum misericordem, tormenta inferni uel nulla uel parua. Sed attendite quam fallax sit iste propheta. Delectationes plurimas et in tempora longa permansuras, penam autem exigua et in breui transituram promittit, et fortassis eterna sunt tormenta
10 que sequuntur, cum id quod delectat etiam ad momentum stare non possit.

295D Alter quadam ratione faciendi auaritie studendum docet: 'Talem hanc uitam esse in qua homo non possit habere honorem, si non habuerit facultatem, diuitias non solum corporibus, sed etiam saluti animarum plurimum sepe prodesse; inde pauperum alimoniam et constructiones ecclesiarum
15 procedere; Postremo melius esse ut habeat homo unde sibi meritum acquirere possit, quam ut nichil habens ab aliis poscere cogatur, unde amplius debitor sit. Sed et istum prophetam mendacem cognoscite. Possidentibus diuitias posse uirtutum merita augmentari prenuntiat, ut ab amantibus diuitias omnia uirtutum merita tollat et primum animos ad querendas diuitias cupiditate, deinde ad
20 retinendas cum acquisite tenacitate corrumpat.

4. aut] atque *pat.*

8. permansuras] permansura Φ

9. transituram] permansuram Φ

10. id quod delectat etiam ad momentum stare] id quod delectat etiam stare ad momentum Φ , id quod delectat ad momentum etiam stare *T1 T2 T3*, id delectat ad momentum quod etiam stare *Re*

11. Alter] Altius *pat.*

15. sibi] *om.* Φ

18. prenuntiat] pronuntiat *Ba pat.*

20. acquisite] exquisite $\Theta \Phi$

296A Est adhuc unus de falsis prophetis qui simulationi deservire suadet.
 Bonam enim opinionem quam maxime ualere, famam suam hominem ubique
 impollutam custodire debere, et si qua fuerint ex infirmitate potius quam ex
 deliberatione peccata, propter scandalum proximorum celanda esse, duplex
 5 dampnum fieri si altero corrupto per factum, alter corrumperetur per exemplum.
 Propterea oportere semper hominem ad eruditionem aliorum habitum laudabilem
 et uirtutis indicem demonstrare, et ne quid sinistrum aut honestati contrarium de
 se aut dicatur aut credatur summo studio uitare debere. **296B** Vehementer
 meritum multiplicari si et semetipsum homo per studium uirtutis exerceat et alios
 10 per exemplum lucrifaciat. O quam subdola promissio. Meritum per simulationem
 multiplicandum prenuntiat, ut cum hominem et mala sua tegere et bona ostentare
 docuerit, omnem boni meriti soliditatem euertat. De istis prophetis peccatrici
 anime et in tribulatione posite per exprobrationem dicitur: ‘Prophete tui uiderunt
 tibi falsa et stulta.’ Ac si diceretur: ‘Falsum esse quod carnales affectus
 15 promittebant uel nunc agnosce erudita per penam quod prius attendere noluisti
 cum traheris ad culpam.’ Falsa et stulta uiderunt tibi. Quando ratione faciendi
 malum tibi persuadebant falsa uiderunt, quando uero etiam ad irrationabiles actus
 cupiditate uictam impellebant, non solum falsa, sed et stulta uiderunt. Vnde
 sequitur: *Nec aperiebant tibi iniquitatem tuam.* Ac si diceretur: ‘Iniquitatem tuam
 20 tibi aperirent ut si ante factum que pena post sequeretur ostenderent. Nunc autem
 ne iniquitatem tuam perspicere posses, quasi dextrum oculum cecabat simulata
 ratio et sinistrum delectatio praua. Nec solummodo deceperunt promittendo
 prospera, sed etiam terrendo per aduersa.’

2. ubique] *om.* Φ

2/3. hominem...impollutam] impollutam hominem Φ^3

4. proximorum] proximorum plurimorum $\Phi^1 \Phi^{3-4}$

11. prenuntiat] pronuntiat *Ba pat.*

tegere] regere $\Delta^1 a.c. E$

15. agnosce] cognosce Θ

17. irrationabiles] irrationales $\Delta Di Ol$

20. factum] actum *DI Di C*

post] *om.* ΦCal

21. perspicere] prospicere Δ^1

Viderunt enim tibi assumptiones falsas et eiectiones. Assumptiones uidelicet malorum que imminere dicebant, et eiectiones bonorum presentium que peritura nuntiabant, quatenus tu cum bona que amabas perdere timeres et mala que timebas euitare studeres citius ad iniquitatem faciendam consentires.

5 **2:15 296D** *Plauserunt* etc. Quasi diceret: ‘Audi et quantum miseranda sis uel alieno testimonio disce.’ Transeuntes per uiam peregrini intelliguntur et extranei. Nam qui transeuntes nominatur, ostenduntur et aliunde uenire et aliorum tendere. Per hoc enim quod aliunde ueniunt demonstrantur alieni sanguine, per hoc quod aliorum tendunt alieni intentione. Et tamen eos quos et affectus sanguinis et
10 propositum intentionis diuidit noue calamitatis stupor ad compassionem figit.

‘Plauserunt’, inquit, ‘manibus super te.’ Pulcre dixit ‘super te’ quasi deiectam et prostratam. *Plauserunt manibus.* **297A** Fuerunt nonnulli qui hec omnia ad irrisiōem et subsannationem potius pertinere existimarent, propterea quod plausus et sibilus insultantium esse uideantur. Quod uero in sequenti
15 clausula rursum de sibilo et insultatione agitur, in hoc differre putatur, quod isti quasi extranei deiectam despiciunt, illi uero quasi hostes et inimici non solum despectum, sed odium quoque sibilando et exultando ostendunt. Qui sensus nec nobis rationi contraire uidetur. Quia tamen secundum spiritualem intelligentiam

12/14. Fuerunt...uideantur: cf. Pasch. *In Lam.* 1132B

18sq.: Quia tamen...insinuat: ibid., 1132C/D

5. Plauserunt etc] Plauserunt super te omnes *pat.*

13. existimarent] putarent Φ^2

18. Quia] Quantum Φ

conuenientius hec ad compassionem referuntur, dicere conuenienter possumus quod per plausum non insultatio sed simpliciter manuum collisio exprimatur. Collisio autem manuum non semper idem significat, sed aliquando gaudium, aliquando dolorem, aliquando admirationem, aliquando compassionem indicat.

5 **297B** Sibilus autem diuersas affectiones indicat, aliquando enim contemptum, aliquando desperationem, aliquando blandimenta insinuat. Similiter motio capitis aliquando indignationem, aliquando insultationem, aliquando dolorem, aliquando admirationem exprimit. Quia ergo motus isti ad diuersas affectiones respiciunt, possumus per plausum manuum admirationem, per sibilum desperationem, per

10 motionem capitis compassionem, siue e conuerso per plausum compassionem, et per motionem capitis admirationem accipere. Transeuntes etenim cum aspiciunt tam lamentabiles ruinas quadam humanitate ad compassionem prouocantur, et dolent de presenti quam uident miseria, desperant autem de reparatione futura, et admirantur de transacta gloria. **297C** Ex dolore compassionis manibus plaudunt,

15 ex desperatione ore sibilant, ex admiratione caput mouent. Et hoc est quod sequitur: *Heccine est urbs dicentes perfecti decoris, gaudium uniuerse terre.* Ac si dicerent: ‘Olim tam gloriosa, modo tam misera.’ Quod tamen ut dictum est non irridendo, sed compatiendo dixisse credendi sunt.

6/10. Similiter...accipere: Pasch., *In Lam.* 1131D

8. ergo] uero Σ *E pat.*

diuersas] aduersas *T1 T2 T3*

10. e conuerso] e contrario *pat.*

11. per motionem...plausum compassionem] *om. T1 T2 T3*

12. tam] *om. Φ*

15. ore] *om. Φ*

Plausuerunt etc. Primum consideremus qui sint transeuntes isti, deinde que sit uia per quam transeunt. Tota uita ista presens transitus quidam esse uidetur, quoniam ex quo eam nascendo ingredimur sine intermissione per quotidianas immutationes ad mortem properamus, sicut in Psalmo legimus: ‘Homo sicut
5 fenum dies eius tanquam flos agri sic effloreat. Quoniam spiritus pertransibit in illo et non subsistet et non cognoscet amplius locum suum.’

297D Sed est alter quidam transitus laudabilis qui non omnibus communis est. Omnes namque homines sicut diximus per necessitatem conditionis transeunt, mali uero cum per conditionem hic manere non possint, mentem tamen in desiderio
10 uite huius per amorem figunt. Transeunt ergo mali necessitate sed uoluntate non transeunt. Boni uero qui presentem uitam non amant, sed futuram desiderant, necessitati uoluntatem adiungunt, immo, ut uerius aliquid dicam, ipsam necessitatem uoluntate preueniunt, quia prius uoluntate hinc exeunt quam morte. Hi sunt ueri Hebrei, id est transeuntes ad quos illud Sapientie uerbum dirigitur:
15 ‘Transite ad me omnes qui concupiscitis me.’ De quorum etiam numero Apostolus Paulus se esse gloriatur cum dicit: ‘Hebrei sunt et ego.’ Quomodo enim Hebreus sit, id est transiens, in alio loco manifestat: ‘Ea’, inquit, ‘que retro sunt oblitus semper in anteriora me extendo.’ Et rursum: ‘Bonum certamen certavi, cursum consummaui, fidem seruaui.’ De hoc etiam transitu Moyses dicit:

4/6. Homo...locum suum: Ps. 102:15

15. Transite...concupiscitis me: Eccli. 24:26

16. Hebrei...ego: 2 Cor. 11:22

17/18. Ea...extendo: Phil. 3:13: (que quidem retro sunt obliuiscens ad ea uero que sunt in priora extendens me)

18/19. Bonum...seruaui: 2 Tim. 4:7

2. uia] illa Φ^{1-2} , illa uia *N*

12. necessitati uoluntatem] necessitatem uoluntati Φ^2 *Ba*

15. etiam] *om. Le N*

18. semper] tamen Δ^1 *a.c. E*

‘Transibo et uidebo uisionem hanc grandem.’ Quia igitur alii sola necessitate transeunt, alii uero necessitati conditionis arbitrium etiam uoluntatis adiungunt, recte hic cum de transeuntibus loqueretur, quia non quoslibet transeuntes acciperet, necessaria adiectione declarauit dicens ‘transeuntes per uiam.’ 298B

5 Via namque in sacro eloquio aliquando Christum, aliquando legem Dei, aliquando presentem uitam significat. Via Christum significat, sicut ipse testatur: ‘Ego sum uia.’ Via legem Dei significat, sicut in Psalmo legitur: ‘Beati immaculati in uia qui ambulant in lege Domini.’ Via presentem uitam significat sicut in Euangelio dicitur: ‘Esto consentiens aduersario tuo dum es in uia.’ Quid namque sermo

10 diuinus nisi aduersarius nobis efficitur, quando nostris uoluntatibus prauis aduersatur? Cui uidelicet aduersario in uia consentientes sumus, si in hac uita mortali, ubi adhuc locus merendi est, preceptis Dei etiam contra nostras carnales uoluntates obtemperare satagimus. 298C Sed et in hoc loco uia uitam presentem

15 significare non potest, quia cum omnis homo per eam necessitate conditionis transeat, distinctionem Propheta non faceret, si de transeuntibus loquens per uiam

1. Transibo...grandem: Ex. 3:3: (Vadam et uidebo uisionem hanc magnam)

6/7. Ego..uia: Ioh. 14:6

7/8. Beati...Domini: Ps. 118:1

9. Esto...uia: Matth. 5:25 (...dum es in uia cum eo)

5. legem Dei] legem Dei significat Θ

9. in uia] in uia cum illo *Ba*, in uia cum eo *Br1 Eb Wa*

12. etiam] *om.* Φ

12/13. carnales uoluntates] uoluntates carnales Θ Φ

uitam presentem significaret. Via ergo Christus est. Et fortassis non sine causa
factum est quod cum Psalmista in quodam loco transeuntes uel pretergredientes
uiam quosdam appellauerit hic non transeuntes uiam , sed per uiam transeuntes
dicit. Viam enim transeunt qui legem Dei preuaricantur et fidem Christi uel
5 acceptam deserunt uel oblatam per uerbum predicationis accipere contempnunt.
Ab his ergo separare uoluit quos non transeuntes uiam, sed per uiam transeuntes
dixit. **298D** Et attende quod non dixit ‘stantes in uia’, sed ‘transeuntes per uiam.’
In uia etenim stant qui fidem sine bonis operibus otiosam seruant. Qui quidem in
uia sunt per rectam fidem sed non ambulant per bonam operationem. Per uiam
10 autem transeunt qui in fide recta quotidiano profectu uirtutum semper de bono in
melius tendunt. Dicatur ergo: ‘Plauserunt super te manibus omnes transeuntes per
uiam.’ Sed quid est quod Ecclesie pro membris suis infirmantibus dicitur:
‘Plauserunt super te manibus omnes transeuntes per uiam’, nisi quod electos
quosque, quos huius mundi oblectamenta a cursu boni operis siue a desiderio
15 eternorum impedire non preualent, pericula proximorum ad compassionem
mouent? **299A** Quod pulcre in libro Regum per duas illas uaccas significatum est
que arcam Domini ab Allophylis redeuntem superimpositam plaustro nouo

7. attende] attendite *Ba P4*

non dixit stantes] non stantes dixit $\Delta^1 G$

16. significatum] figuratum Φ^1

gestabant de quibus scriptum est: ‘Tollentes duas uaccas que lactabant uitulos, iunxerunt ad plastrum uitulosque earum domi concluderunt.’ Et paulo post: ‘Ibant in directum uacce per uiam que ducit Bethsamis pergentes et mugientes et non declinabant neque ad dexteram neque sinistram.’ Quid enim uacce nisi fideles
5 quosque in Ecclesia et quid arca nisi legem Dei, et quid Bethsamis, que interpretatur domus solis, nisi celestem patriam designat? **299B** Vacce igitur quasi arcam superimpositam gestantes, pergentes et mugientes, recto itinere Bethsamis uadunt, quando fideles legis diuine meditationem iugiter in corde suo portantes per uiam boni operis ad celestem patriam tendunt et pergentes pro his quos adhuc
10 carnalis affectus in hoc mundo obligat mugitus compassionis edunt, qui nec propter compassionem a recto itinere declinant, nec propter itineris propositum a mugitu compassionis cessant. Idipsum in hoc loco Propheta innuit dicens: ‘Plauserunt super te manibus omnes transeuntes per uiam.’ Plaudunt enim et simul transeunt quia sic afflictis compassionis sue affectum exhibent, ut tamen a
15 proposito recti itineris nec deficiant nec declinent. Cuius compassionis modus recte subinfertur cum dicitur: ‘Plauserunt manibus...sibilauerunt...mouerunt caput.’ In sacro eloquio sepe per manus operatio, per os locutio, et per caput

1/4. Tollentes...sinistram: 1 Reg. 6:10 (Ibant...que ducit Bethsames et itinere uno gradiebatur pergentes et mugientes...)

3. Bethsamis] Bethsames *P4 Wa*

5. Bethsamis] Bethsames *P4*

que] quod $\Theta \Phi V H$, id est *Le*

7. gestantes] portantes Σ^2

8. uadunt] pergunt Σ^2

mens designari solet. **299C** Si igitur per manus opera designari dicimus, quid in
plausu manuum nisi fama et opinionem bonorum operum accipere debemus? Fama
namque et opinio bonorum operum uelut quidam manuum plausus in auribus
populi sonat et sepe cum repentina perstreperit omnium oculos in suum a quo
5 orta est auctorem conuertit. Hinc est enim quod peruersi quique in his que recte
agere uidentur semper innotescere uolunt ut uidelicet dum bene acta sua in
medium spectanda adduxerint, rudes animos populi in admiratione sui conuertant.
Electi uero in bonis actibus suis tanto amplius manifestari refugiunt, quanto magis
eternae retributionis premium ex admixtione terrene laudis imminui sibi
10 pertimescunt. **299D** Quod si aliquando uirtutes suas et fortia acta sua proximis
suis ad exemplum proponunt, nequaquam hoc desiderio gloriandi sed amore
consulendi faciunt. Vnde et hic recte sub typo desolate ciuitatis multitudini
peccantium dicitur: ‘Plauserunt super te manibus omnes transeuntes per uiam.’
Electi namque qui per uiam mandatorum Dei de huius mundi exilio ad celestem
15 patriam transeunt, sepe dum infirmantes proximos uident, ex affectu caritatis ad
prouocandos animos eorum uirtutes suas in exemplum proponunt. Illi autem qui
per deuium transeunt super iacentes non plangunt, quia uirtutes suas non propter
utilitatem proximorum, sed propter gloriam propriam dilatandam ostendunt.

4. perstreperit] streperit Δ^1 a.c. E

9. admixtione] admiratione Σ (excepto L2) pat. p.c.E

10. Quod] Qui pat.

11. suis] om. $\Theta \Sigma$

18. propriam] om. Φ

dilatandam] dilatatam P2 P3

300A Sequitur: *Sibilauerunt* etc. Solent ad sibilum formandum extrinsecus labia contrahi et intrinsecus lingua quodammodo in similitudinem canalis sinuata substerni, ut dum spiritus per artum ductus et extenuatus emanat mollior blandiorque ad auditum demulcendum perueniat. Quid igitur rectius per sibilum
5 oris quam consolationis uerbum intelligi potest? Quasi enim contractis labiis et lingua substrata sibilare est emollitis et temperatis uerbis omne loquendi studium ad usum consolationis inflectere. Transeuntes igitur per uiam super desolatos et manibus plaudunt et ore sibilant, quando spirituales quique peccatores et per exempla uirtutum ad bene agendum prouocant, et per uerbum consolationis ad
10 spem uenie confirmant.

300B *Mouerunt caput suum*. Per caput non inconuenienter mentem accipere possumus. Per motionem capitis compassionem mentis. Bene ergo transeuntes post plausum et sibilum etiam caput mouent, quia profecto alienos dolores efficaciter consolari nequeunt, qui doloribus alienis ueraciter compati non
15 nouerunt. Videte si Paulo aliquid horum defuit. Manibus plausit Paulus quando dicebat: ‘Imitatores mei estote sicut et ego Christi.’ Ore sibilauit quando Corinthios post peractam penitentiam consolans ait: ‘Scripsi uobis non ut contristemini, sed ut sciatis quam caritatem habeam abundantius in uobis.’ Caput mouit quando dicebat: ‘Filioli mei quos iterum parturio donec formetur Christus
20 in uobis.’

16. Imitatores...Christi: 1 Cor. 11:1

17/18. 2 Cor. 2:4 Scripsi uobis per multas lacrimas etc.

19/20. Gal. 4:19

4. igitur] ergo Θ

6. substrata] subtracta Θ, subtracta Φ¹⁻³ N

12. ergo] autem Ω

15. aliquid] aliquod V pat.

17. peractam] om. Σ

ait] om. pat.

19. mei Di G Le] om. cett. .

300C Sequitur: *Super filiam Ierusalem*. Quid Ierusalem que uisio pacis
 interpretatur nisi celestem patriam designat? Ac si peccatoribus diceretur: ‘Tanto
 grauiorem electis quibusque de uestra perditione luctum facitis, quanto iam
 certum est quod ad consortium et societatem electorum pertinere debuistis. Et
 5 quemadmodum uestra salus omnibus gaudium faceret, ita quoque de ruina uestra
 dolor uniuersorum et tristitia procedet.’¹ Et hoc est quod sequitur: *Heccine est urbs
 dicentes perfecti decoris, gaudium uniuerse terre?* Vrbs namque in hoc loco
 Ecclesia catholica intelligenda est, in qua porte et muri sunt hi qui alios et doctrina
 ueritatis informant et circumspectione ambiunt. Que uidelicet Ecclesia tunc
 10 perfectum decorem habet, quando et in prelatis uirtus ornat sapientiam et in
 subiectis obedientia bonorum operum disciplinam. 300D Huius ergo ciuitatis
 decor recte gaudium uniuerse terre dicitur, quia eius disciplina iam per omnes
 mundi partes dilatatur. Dicatur ergo: ‘Heccine est urbs decoris, gaudium uniuerse
 terre?’ Quasi diceretur: Quomodo tam cito in desolationem uenire potuit que
 15 prius decore suo uniuersos per mundi circulum electos letificauit? Sed quid est
 quod in ruina quorundam tota Ecclesia quasi desolata plangitur, nisi quia dum
 patitur unum membrum omnia membra compatiuntur? Propter quod ualde
 pertimescere debent hi qui in sua iniquitate caritatem aliorum contristant, quia
 profecto sicut illi malis compatiendo sibi adaugent meritum, ita et isti bonos
 20 contristando aggrauant reatum suum.

1. Sequitur] *om.* Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*, Sequitur in littera *pat.*

3. quibusque] quibus Σ , quibuslibet *pat.*

uestra] uestri *pat.*

4. certum] certius *pat.*

6. procedet] procedit Φ^2 *C P4*, procederet *P1*

10. uirtus ornat] ornat uirtus Φ

15. circulum] circuitum Φ^2

17. omnia membra compatiuntur] compatiuntur omnia membra Φ

19. compatiendo] consentiendo Φ^{1-2} Φ^4 *N*, condescendo *p.c.* *B*

301A *Plauserunt* etc. Qui peccatorem blanda exhortatione ad penitentiam
prouocat, quid aliud quam egroti uulnera ante sectionem palpat? Sicut igitur plaga
que nec lenem quidem medicantis tactum sustinere potest, omnino insanabilis
creditur, ita peccator qui etiam blandam admonitionem respuit quasi incorrigibilis
5 reputatur. Hoc est quod Propheta hic peccatrici anime cum graui dolore exprobrat
dicens: 'Plauserunt super te' etc. Ac si diceret: 'Prius carnis suggestio facile tibi
ad persuadendam iniquitatem preualere potuit, nunc uero omnis sollicitudo et
industria bonorum in tua correctione defecit, quantumque prius ad perpetrandam
iniquitatem per contemptum fuisti temeraria, tantum nunc in ipsa iniquitate tua per
10 desperationem es obdurata.'

301B *Plauserunt super te manibus omnes transeuntes per uiam*. Vt tanto
grauior ruina eius ostendatur, iam boni operis uiam ingressam fuisse^S commemorat,
et quasi in medio itinere collapsam, unde et alios transeuntes uocat ut aperte
demonstret quod hi qui eam nunc merito uirtutum precedere incipiunt, aliquando
15 posteriores fuerunt. Sed quia electos in ruina proximorum semper et caritas ad
compassionem prouocat, et exemplum ad timorem, recte et transeuntes pariter et
plaudentes describuntur. Proficiendo enim transeunt, compatiendo plaudunt,
quatenus sic de profectu suo gaudeant, ut tamen in infirmitate iacentes proximos
despicere non presumant.

1. exhortatione] hortatione Δ^1 a.c. E

3. quidem] om. N

medicantis] medicamentis Le pat.

8. in tua correctione] in te Φ , in tui correctione pat.

9. tantum] tamen pat.

16. recte] recte isti Θ

301C *Plauserunt*, inquit, *manibus*. Plausus manuum exemplum boni operis, sibilus uerbum consolationis, motio capitis affectum compassionis designat, quia spirituales quique eos quos per iniquitatem corruisse uident, et exemplo prouocant, et uerbo confirmant, et quantum de eorum salute gauderent, 5 ipso compassionis sue dolore demonstrant.

Sequitur: *Heccine est urbs dicentes perfecti decoris?* Iccirco commemorant quid esse debuerat, ut ad quam miseriam dilapsa sit, citius ex memoria preterite dignitatis agnoscat. Urbem uocant quasi sublimem et munitam uirtutibus, que prius Deum in se regnantem habuit, quando adhuc dominio 10 uitiorum per consensum subiecta non fuit.

Sequitur: *Gaudium uniuerse terre*. Ac si dicatur: ‘Quanto plures de eius profectu gaudere debuerant, tanto plures nunc eius ruina et desolatio contristat, ut si sibi parcere non uult, saltem alios in sua perditione affligere erubescat. 301D Omnibus his modis conuenitur indurata conscientia, ut tam multiplici medicamine 15 adhibito tandem ad penitentiam emollescat.

4. gauderent] gaudent Φ , gaudeant Δ^1 a.c. E

7. debuerat] deberet Δ^1 a.c. E

10. per consensum] om. Φ

13. sua] sui *pat.*

14. conuenitur] conuertitur Δ^1 a.c. E, conuenienter P2 P3, conuenit Le

15. ad penitentiam] om. Φ

2:16 *Aperuerunt* etc. Quasi diceret: ‘Si non mouet te quod a falsis prophetis illusa es, quod in calamitatem collapsa in signum et prodigium transeuntibus posita es, uel hoc insensibilitatem tuam compungat, quod inimicis tuis in predam et conculcationem in gaudium et subsannationem facta es.’

5 *Aperuerunt*, inquit, *super te os suum omnes inimici tui*. Apertio oris crudelitatem et subsannationem designat. **302A** *Aperuerunt os auidi ad deuorandum. Aperuerunt os superbi ad subsannandum.*

Sibilauerunt, fremuerunt dentibus suis. Sibilus contemptum exprimit, fremitus iram et indignationem. Omnes inimici tui Chaldei, Romani. Grauis
10 pressura ubi omnes infesti, ubi omnes premunt et omnes preualent.

 Sequitur: *Et dixerunt: ‘Deuorabimus’*. Non parum nocere uolunt, sed usque ad consumptionem delere, nec solum delere, sed deuorare, quia pascuntur et delectantur in ruina tua. Vnde sequitur: *En ista est dies quam expectauimus*
 desiderando, inuenimus querendo, uidimus exultando. Vt quanto affligentium te
15 maior est letitia, tanto amarior et intolerabilior sit miseria tua.

5. oris] oris tui *pat.*

8. Sibilauerunt, fremuerunt] Sibilauerunt et fremuerunt Φ^4

10. ubi omnes infesti] *om. pat.*

12. quia] qui *pat.*

13/14. *En ista...exultando*] *En ista est dies quam expectauimus, inuenimus, uidimus,*
uam expectauimus desiderando, *inuenimus querendo, uidimus exultando* Φ

302B *Aperuerunt* etc. Inimici sancte Ecclesie heretici sunt, qui fidei eius
 constantiam prauis dogmatibus impugnant. Sed isti contra eam os suum aperire
 non presumunt, quandiu in conuersatione eius sapientiam simul et disciplinam
 florere conspiciunt. Contra sapientiam namque os claudunt, quia ab his quos in
 5 cognitione ueritatis stabiles uident, erroris sui documenta abscondunt. Contra
 disciplinam iterum os claudunt quando in conuersatione fidelium quid blasphemare
 possint non inueniunt. Quod si forte sapientia disciplinam perdiderit, contra eam
 os aperiunt, ut blasphement, aut si disciplina sapientiam non habuerit, contra eam
 os aperiunt, ut errores disseminent. 302C Si uero nec sapientia nec disciplina in ea
 10 fuerit, iam non solum contra eam, sed super eam os aperiunt, ut deuorent et quasi
 incorporando sibi omnes reliquias ueritatis consumant in eis quos ad suum
 consortium trahere ualent.

Sequitur: *Sibilauerunt*. In sibilo notare possumus uersutas et blandas
 persuasiones quibus incautos decipiunt, et quasi serpentes post lenem sibilum
 15 uenenum mortis infundunt. Quia uero blandimenta hereticorum non ex pietate, sed
 ex crudelitate procedunt, recte subiungitur: *Fremuerunt dentibus suis*. Ac si
 diceretur: ‘Blandum erat quod locutio sibilauit, sed nimis crudele quod intentio
 fremuit.’

3. eius] *om.* Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*

6. iterum] *autem* ~~*C*~~ ^{*P7*} *autem* *item* Σ^2 *p.c.E*

quid] *quod pat.*

7. possint] *possit pat.*

8. ut blasphement...os aperiunt] *om. T1 T2 T3*

Sequitur: *En ista est dies quam expectauimus, inuenimus, uidimus.*
 Oppressionem bonorum non noctem sed diem nominant, quia inde ipsi per
 iniquam letitiam lucent, unde alios tenebre infidelitatis excecant. **302D**
 ‘Expectauimus’, iniquiunt, scilicet desiderantes, ‘inuenimus’ querentes,
 5 ‘uidimus’ exultantes. Et nota quia quod occultum est inuenitur, quod uidetur
 apertum. Ac si dicerent: ‘Quod prius uel in occulto inuenire desiderauimus, nunc
 manifestum uidemus.’

Aperuerunt super te etc. Demones contra animam os aperiunt, quando
 erectam in bonis desideriis uocibus suggestionis pulsant. Super eam autem os
 10 aperiunt quando iacenti in praua delectatione non iam suadent iniquitatem sed
 imperant. Vel supra eam os aperiunt, quam cum prius blandiendo ad culpam
 traxerint, postmodum seuiundo ad penam exposcunt. **303A** Vnde subditur:
Sibilauerunt, fremuerunt dentibus suis. Prius enim sibilant ac deinde dentibus
 fremunt, quia sicut diximus post blandam suggestionem, crudeliter penam
 15 exposcunt. De qua uidelicet pena adhuc subinfertur cum dicitur: ‘Et dixerunt:
 “Deuorabimus”.’ Quid namque est aliud deuorare nisi animam exeuntem a
 corpore ad dampnationem eternam absorbere? Sciendum uero est quod nunquam
 animam a corpore exeuntem deuorare sufficiunt, quam prius in corpore positam
 igne uitiorum non excoxerunt. Et iccirco de futura dampnatione hominis magna
 20 eis fiducia nascitur, cum ei in presenti uita per iniquitatem dominantur. Postquam

1. est] *om.* Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*

6. nunc] etiam Δ^1 *a.c.* *E*

9. erectam] erectum *pat.*

10. iacenti] iacentes *pat.*

12. traxerint] traxerunt *pat.*

13. Sibilauerunt, fremuerunt] Sibilauerunt et fremuerunt *Ba N*

16. animam exeuntem *emendaui*] exeuntem animam Σ^2 , animam *om. cett.*

igitur dixerat: ‘Aperuerunt os...Sibilauerunt’, recte statim adiunxit dicens:
‘Fremuerunt dentibus suis.’ **303B** Dixerunt ‘deuorabimus’ quia ex quo homo
suggestioni eorum per consensum peccati subicitur, statim furore uenture
crudelitatis accinguntur, et quia escam diuturna decoctione iam emollitam
5 aspiciunt, proximam sibi deuorationem promittunt. In quo uidelicet nomine
deuorationis et uehemens eorum desiderium demonstratur, et simul acerbitas
dampnationis exprimitur.

Sequitur: *En ista est dies quam expectauimus, inuenimus, uidimus*. Qui
inuenisse se dicunt, quesisse etiam se priusquam inuenirent innuunt. Prius igitur
10 demones querunt, quando secretam intentionem cordis nostri per suggestionem
experiri satagunt, deinde expectant, quia etsi quando temptandi licentiam
accipiunt, nunquam tamen uim temptato ad consentiendum inferre possunt. **303C**
Post inquisitionem autem et expectationem inueniunt, quando post immissam
suggestionem, tandem spontanei consensus manifesta signa de corde prodire
15 conspiciunt. Ad postremum etiam uident quando consensus sceleris usque ad
effectum procedit operationis.

3. peccati] *om.* Φ

4. diuturna] iam diuturna $\Phi^1 \Phi^4$, tam diuturna Φ^3

9. igitur] ergo $\Theta \Phi^{1-4}$

13. quando] quandoque *pat.*

14. prodire] exire Φ

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources I: Hugh of St Victor

Chronicon/De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum, partial editions in the following: G. Waitz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historicae, Scriptores*, 24, pp.88-97; W. M. Green, 'De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum,' *Speculum* 18 (1943), 488-492.

De laude caritatis, PL 176, cols 970D-976D.

De grammatica, ed. by R. Baron, in *Hugonis de Sancto Victore opera propaedeutica* (Notre Dame: Indiana, 1966), pp.75-163.

De institutione nouitiorum, PL 176, cols 925A-951B.

De oratione dominica, PL 175, cols 774B-789A.

De quinque septenis, PL 175, cols 405A-414B.

De sacramentis, PL 176, cols 173A-618B; trans. by R. J. Deferrari (Cambridge: Massachusetts, 1951).

Descriptio mappe mundi, ed. P. Gautier Dalché, *La <Descriptio mappe mundi> de Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Paris, 1988).

De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris, PL 175, 9A-28D.

De tribus diebus, PL 176, cols 811B-838D.

De uanitate mundi, PL 176, cols 703A-740C.

De uirtute orandi, PL 176, cols 977A-988A.

Didascalicon, ed. by C. H. Buttmer (Washington, 1939); PL 176, cols 739D-812B; trans. by J. Taylor *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St Victor* (New York, 1961).

Expositio super Regulam Beati Augustini, PL 176, cols 881A-924D.

In canticum Beate Marie, PL 175, cols 413B-432B.

In Ecclesiasten, PL 175, cols 113B-256C.

Institutiones in Decalogum, PL 176, cols 9A-18B.

'Maria porta. Christus homo et Deus' ed. R. Baron, 'La pensée mariale de Hugues de Saint-Victor', *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 31 (Toulouse, 1955), 271

Miscellanea, PL 175, cols 469C-900C.

Notule in Pentateuchum, Iudices et Reges, PL 175, 29A-114B.

Practica geometrie, ed. by R. Baron, in *Hugonis de Sancto Victore opera propaedeutica* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1966), pp.15-64.

Sententie de diuinitate, ed. by A.M. Piazzoni, 'Ugo di Santo Vittore 'auctor' delle *Sententie de diuinitate*', *Studi Medievali*, 23 (1962), 861-955.

Sermon: 'Egredietur uirga et flos de radice Iesse' ed. by R. Baron, 'La pensée mariale de Hugues de Saint-Victor', *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 31 (Toulouse, 1955), 269-71.

Soliloquium de arrha anime, PL 175, cols 951B-970D.

Primary Souces II: Other Works

Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, ed. by B. Dombart and A. Kalb, 2 vols (1928-9).

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, ed. by J. Leclercq and H. Rochais in *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, VII-VIII (Rome, 1977).

Bonaventure, *Opusculum de redactione artium ad theologiam*, V (Claras Aquas, 1882-1902).

Cassian, John, *Collationes*, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 13 (Vienna, 1886), reprinted in E. Pichery (tr.), *Sources chrétiennes*, 54 (Paris, 1958).

Glossa ordinaria in librum Threnorum, in *Biblia Latina cum glossa ordinaria*, facsimile reprint of the *editio princeps* Adolph Rusch of Strassburg 1480/81, intro. by K. Froehlich and M. T. Gibson (Turnhout, 1992).

Gregory, *Moralia in Iob*, ed. by M. Adriaen, CCSL 143-143A-143B (Turnhout, 1979-85).

Guibert of Nogent, *Quo ordine sermo fieri debeat* (= prologue to *Moralia in Genesim*), PL 156, cols 21B-32C.

Tractatus de incarnatione contra Iudaeos, PL 156, cols 489A-528C.

Tropologiae in prophetis, PL 156, cols 449D-488C.

Hildebert of Lavardin, *Epistulae*, 1.1 (PL 171, cols 141A-312C).

--- *Sermo CI contra Iudaeos de incarnatione*, PL 171, cols 811D-814C.

Hugh of Fouilloy, *De claustro animae*, PL 176, 1011A-1182D.

Hrabanus Maurus, *Enarrationes in epistolas Pauli: Ad Galatas*, *PL* 112, cols 254A-382C.

--- *Expositio super Hieremiam*, *PL* 111, cols 793A-1272C.

Jerome, *Epistulae*, ed. by I. Hilberg, *CSEL* 54 (Vienna-Leipzig, 1910).

Liber ordinis Sancti Victoris Parisiensis, ed. by L. Jocqué and L. Milis, *CCCM* 61 (Turnhout, 1984).

Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in Lamentationes Hieremiae*, ed. by B. Paulus. *Expositio in Lamentationes*, *CCCM* 85 (Turnhout, 1988).

--- *Expositio in Mathaeo*, *CCCM* 56-56A-56B (Turnhout, 1984).

Richard of St Victor, *Beniamin minor* (*PL* 196, cols 1A-202B).

Robert de Torigny, *De immutatione ordinis monachorum*, *PL* 202, cols 1309B-1320B.

Rupert of Deutz, 'Anulus seu dialogus inter Christianum et Iudaeum', ed. by M. L. Arduini (Rome, 1979).

--- *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius*, ed. by R. Haacke, *CCCM* 21-29 (Turnhout, 1971-2).

Primary Sources III: CD-ROMS

Cetedoc Library of Christian Latin Texts, *CCL* (Turnhout, 1994).

In principio: Incipit Index of Latin Texts, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes (CNRS) and Hill Monastic Library, Collegeville, Minnesota (Turnhout, 1993).

Patrologia Latina (Chadwyck Healey Ltd., 1995).

Manuscript Catalogues

Austria

Graz: Kern, A., *Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek in Graz*, 3 vols (Leipzig, 1942-67).

Innsbruck: Neuhauser, W., *Katalog der Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Innsbruck*, 2 vols (Vienna, 1987-91).

Vienna: *Tabulae codicum manuscriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobensi asservatorum*, 11 vols (Vienna, 1864-1912).

Belgium

Catalogue général des manuscrits des Bibliothèques de Belgique 6 vols (Gembloux, 1934-39).

Brussels: Van den Gheyn, J., *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique*, 13 vols (Brussels, 1901-1948).

Britain

Ker, Neil R., *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, 4 vols (Oxford, 1969-92).

Cambridge: *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge* (Hildesheim and New York, reprint, 1980).

James, M. R., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Peterhouse* (Cambridge, 1899).

- *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Sidney Sussex College* (Cambridge, 1895).

Edinburgh: Borland, C. G., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Library of the University of Edinburgh* (Cambridge, 1916).

Eton: James, M. R., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Library of Eton College* (Cambridge, 1895).

Hereford: Mynors, Roger A. B. and Thomson, Rodney M., *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Hereford Cathedral Library* (Hereford, 1993).

London: *A Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Library in the years 1854-1860* (London, 1965).

Warner, G. F., and Gilson, J. P., *British Library. Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections* (London, 1921).

Moorat, S. A. J., *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts on Medicine and Science in the Wellcome Historical Medical Library*, 2 vols (London, 1973).

Oxford: Coxe, H. O., *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum qui in collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adservatur* (Oxford, 1852).

Madan, F., Craster, H. H. E. and Denholm-Young, N., *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford which have not hitherto been described in the Quarto Series* (Oxford, 1922).

James, M. R., *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903).

Worcester: K. J. Floyer, *Catalogue of Manuscripts preserved in the Chapter Library of Worcester Cathedral*, (Oxford, 1906).

France

Paris: *Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, 5 vols (Paris, 1939-68).

Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine, 3 vols (Paris, 1885).

Delisle, L., *Inventaire des manuscrits de la Sorbonne conservés à la Bibliothèque Impériale*, 5 vols (Paris, 1863-71).

Catalogue général des manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques des Départements (Paris, 1849-)

Czech Republic

Prague Truhlár, J., *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum latinorum qui in C. R. Bibliotheca Publica atque Universitatis Pragensis asservantur* (Prague, 1905).

Germany

Leipzig: Helssig, R., *Katalog der Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek zu Leipzig*, Section IV: *Die lateinischen und deutschen Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek zu Leipzig* (Leipzig, 1926-1935).

Munich: Halm C., and Laubmann, G., *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis*, 6 vols (Munich, 1874-1881).

Italy

Mazzatinti, G., and Sorbelli, A., *Inventari dei manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia* (Forli, 1890-).

Naples: Cenci, *Manoscritti francescani della Biblioteca Nazionale de Napoli*, 2 vols (Grottaferrata, 1971).

The Netherlands

The Hague *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae*, 2 vols (The Hague, 1922).

Portugal

Lisbon: *Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa: Inventario dos codices alcobacenses*, 2 vols (Lisbon, 1930).

--- T. L. Amos, *The 'Fundo Alcobaça' of the Biblioteca Nacional, Lisbon*, 3 vols (Collegeville: Minnesota, 1988-90).

Spain

Valencia: Olmos y Canalda, E., *Catálogo descriptivo: Códices de la Catedral de Valencia* (Valencia, 1943).

United States

De Ricci, S., and Wilson, W. J., *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, 3 vols (New York, 1935-46); Supplement (New York, 1962).

Secondary Sources

Arbesmann, Rudolph, 'The Concept of *Christus medicus* in St Augustine,' *Traditio* 10 (1954), 1-28.

Baron, Roger, 'Etude sur l'authenticité de l'oeuvre de Hugues de Saint-Victor d'après les manuscrits Paris Mazarine 717, BN 14506 et Douai 360-366' *Scriptorium* X (1956), 182-220.

--- 'Hugues de Saint-Victor', in M. Viller (ed.), *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, 7 (Paris, 1969), cols 901-939.

--- *Science et sagesse chez Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Paris, 1957).

Battles, F. L., 'Hugo of St Victor as a moral allegorist', *Church History*, 18, 220-40.

- Baudrillart, Alfred, et al. *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1912-)
- Bautier, R.-Henri, 'Origines et premiers développements de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor', in J. Longère (ed.), *L'abbaye parisienne de St-Victor au Moyen Age. Communications présentées aux deuxième colloque d'Humanisme médiévale de Paris (1986-88)* (Paris, 1991), pp.23-52.
- Becker, G. H., *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui* (Bonn, 1885).
- Benson, Robert L. and Constable, Giles (eds), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Massachusetts, 1982).
- Berndt, Rainer, *André de Saint-Victor, exégète et théologien* (Paris-Turnhout, 1991).
- Blumenkranz, Bernard, *Le juif médiéval au miroir de l'art chrétien* (Paris, 1966).
- Bondéelle-Souchier, Anne, *Bibliothèques cisterciennes dans la France médiévale* (Paris, 1991).
- Bonnard, Fourier, *Histoire de l'abbaye royale et de l'ordre des chanoines réguliers de St-Victor*, 2 vols (Paris, 1904).
- Buc, Philippe, *L'Ambiguïté du Livre: prince, pouvoir et peuple dans les commentaires de la Bible au moyen âge* (Paris, 1994).
- Buchwald, Wolfgang, Hohlweg, Armin and Prinz, Otto, *Tusculum-Lexikon: griechischer und lateinischer Autoren des Altertums und des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1963).
- Châtillon, Jean, 'Le *Duodecim Patriarchis* ou *Beniamin minor* de Richard de Saint-Victor: description et essai de classification des manuscrits', *Revue d'histoire des textes*, 21 (1991), 159-236.
- 'La culture de l'Ecole de Saint-Victor au XII^e siècle', in M. de Gandillac and E. Jeaneau (eds), *Entretiens sur la renaissance du XII^e siècle* (Paris-The Hague, 1968), pp.147-178.
- 'Le recueil de Proverbes glosés du cistercien Galland de Rigny', *Revue du Moyen-Age Latin* 9 (1953), 10-12.
- 'La transmission de l'oeuvre de Hugues: à propos d'un livre récent de Rudolph Goy', *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch* 15 (1980), 57-62.

- Chenu, Marie-Dominique, *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*, selected, edited and translated by J. Taylor and L. K. Little (Toronto-Buffalo-London, 2nd reprint, 1997).
- Cowdrey, H. E. J., *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform* (Oxford, 1970).
- Cross, Frank L. and Livingstone, E. A., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford, 3rd edition, 1997).
- De Ghellinck, Joseph, *Le Mouvement théologique du douzième siècle* (Bruges-Brussels-Paris, 1948).
- 'La table de matières de la première édition des oeuvres de Hugues de Saint-Victor, *Recherches de science religieuse* I, 1910, 270-89 and 385-96.
- De Hamel, Christopher, *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade* (Woodbridge: New Hampshire, 1984).
- *A History of Illuminated Manuscripts* (London, 1994).
- De Lubac, Henri, *Exégèse médiévale: les quatre sens de l'Ecriture*, 4 vols (Paris, 1961).
- Faucon, M., *La Librairie des papes d'Avignon. Sa formation, sa composition, ses catalogues (1316-1420)* (Paris, 1886).
- Gerz von Büren, Veronika, et al. (eds), *La Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de Saint-Victor de Claude de Grandrue 1514* (Paris, 1983).
- Gibson, Margaret T., *The Bible in the The Latin West, The Medieval Book, Vol. I* (Notre Dame-London, 1993).
- Gjerlöv, L., 'A Twelfth-century Victorine or Cistercian Manuscript in the Library of Elverum' *Revue Bénédictine*, 82 (1972).
- Gobry, I., *Le 'De clauastro anime' d'Hugues de Fouillo* (Eklipta 74, N.P., 1995).
- Goy, Rudolph, *Die Überlieferung der Werke Hugos^S von Sankt-Viktor: ein Beitrag zur Kommunikationsgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, 1976).
- Häring, N. M., 'Commentaries and Hermeneutics' in R. L. Benson and G. Constable, *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1982), pp.173-200.
- Hauréau, B., *Hugues de Saint-Victor: Nouvel examen de l'édition de ses oeuvres* (Paris, 1859).

- Hildenfinger, Paul, 'La figure de la Synagogue dans l'art du moyen âge', *Revue des études juives*, 47, 1903, 187-196.
- Hunt, Richard W., *The Library of St Albans Abbey*, in M. B. Parkes and A. G. Watson (eds), *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries: Essays presented to N. R. Ker* (London, 1978), pp.251-77.
- Huygens, R. B. C., 'La Tradition manuscrite de Guibert de Nogent', *Instrumenta patristica*, XXI (The Hague, 1991).
- Illich, Ivan, *In the Vineyard of the Text: A Commentary on Hugh's 'Didascalicon'* (Chicago and London, 1993).
- James, M. R., *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903)
- 'The Library of the Grey Friars of Hereford' in A.G. Little et al. (eds) *Collectanea Franciscana*, (Aberdeen, 1914).
- Jullien de Pommerol, Marie-Henriette and Monfrin, Jacques, *La bibliothèque pontificale à Avignon et à Peñiscola* (Rome, 1991).
- Lawrence, Clifford H., *Medieval Monasticism* (London and New York, 2nd edition, 1989).
- Longère, Jean, (ed.), *L'abbaye parisienne de St-Victor au Moyen Age. Communications présentées aux deuxième colloque d'Humanisme médiévale de Paris (1986-88)* (Paris, 1991).
- Lottin, Odon, 'Quelques recueils d'écrits attribués à Hugues de Saint-Victor', *Revue de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 25 (1958), 248-284.
- Matter, E. Ann, 'The Lamentations Commentaries of Hrabanus Maurus and Paschasius Radbertus', *Traditio* 38 (1983), 137-163.
- Migne, Jacques Paul (ed.), *Patrologia Latina*, 221 vols (Paris, 1844-71).
- Mynors, Roger, A. B., Rouse, Richard H. and Mary A. R., (eds) *Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues (London, 1991).
- Nortier, Geneviève, *Les Bibliothèques médiévales des abbayes bénédictines de Normandie* (Paris, 1971).
- Pollitt, Henry P., 'Hugh of St Victor as Biblical Exegete' (unpublished Ph.D, Sheffield University, 1960).

- Reynolds, Leighton D (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983).
- Rouse, Richard H., 'The early library of the Sorbonne', *Scriptorium*, 21 (1967), 42-71.
- 'Manuscripts belonging to Richard of Fournival', *Revue d'Histoire des Textes*, 3 (1973), 253-269.
- Sadie, Stanley (ed.), *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 20 vols (London and Washington D.C., 1980).
- Schreckenberg, Heinz, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos Texte (11-13 Jh), mit einer Ikonographie des Judenthemas bis zum IV Laterankonzil* (Frankfurt-am-Main, Bern, New York and Paris, 1988).
- Die Juden in der Kunst Europas: Ein historischer Bildatlas* (Göttingen-Freiburg in Breisgau, 1996).
- Sicard, Patrice, *Hugues de Saint-Victor et son école* (Brepols, Turnhout, 1991).
- Smalley, Beryl, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 3rd edition, 1984).
- Southern, Richard William, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1953).
- *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe*, 1 (Oxford, 1995).
- Spicq, Ceslas, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen-âge* (Paris, 1944).
- Stegmüller, Friedrich, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi* (Madrid, 1950-80).
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Leipzig, 1900-).
- Stirnemann, Patricia, 'La production des manuscrits et la bibliothèque de Saint-Victor', J. Longère (ed.) *L'abbaye parisienne de Saint-Victor au moyen âge* (Paris, 1991), pp. 140-1.
- Thompson, J. W., *The Medieval Library* (Chicago, 1939).
- Thomson, Rodney M., *Manuscripts from St Alban's Abbey 1066-1235*, (University of Tasmania, 1982).
- Van den Eynde, Damian, *Le 'Liber Magistri Hugonis'*, *Franciscan Studies* 23 (1963), 268-99.
- Van der Meer, Frédéric, *Atlas de l'Ordre cistercien* (Amsterdam-Brussels, 1965).

- Van Zwieten, Jan W. M., *The Place and Significance of Literal Exegesis in Hugh of St Victor: an Analysis of his Notes on the Pentateuch, the Book of Judges, and the Four Books of Kings* (Amsterdam, 1992).
- Vauchez, André, *La Spiritualité au Moyen Age occidental* (Paris 1994).
- Vernet, André, *La Bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Clairvaux du douzième au dix-huitième siècle*, I, *Catalogues et répertoires* (Paris, 1979).
- Viller, Marcel (ed.), *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique: doctrine et histoire* (Paris, 1937-).
- Weisweiler, Heinrich, 'Die Arbeitsmethode Hugos von Sankt Viktor. Ein Beitrag zum Entstehen seines Haupteswerkes *De sacramentis*', in *Scholastik*, 20-24 (1949), 59-87, 232-67.
- Wetherbee, Winthrop, 'Philosophy, cosmology and the Renaissance', in P. Dronke (ed.), *A History of Western Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988).
- Williams, T. W., 'Gloucestershire Medieval Libraries' in *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society for 1910*.

